





*Williams College Library*







# COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 2

---

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

## COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

---

APRIL 17, 23, 24, 25; MAY 16, 17, AND 18, 1951

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1951

## COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

### UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JOHN S. WOOD, Georgia, *Chairman*

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Senior Investigator*

JOHN W. CARRINGTON, *Clerk of Committee*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

## CONTENTS

---

<b>April 17, 1951:</b>		<b>Page</b>
Testimony of—		
Sam Moore.....		303
Harold Buchman.....		312
Anne Revere.....		318
William A. Wheeler.....		321
<b>April 23, 1951:</b>		
Testimony of John Jules Garfield.....		328
<b>April 24, 1951:</b>		
Testimony of—		
Marc Lawrence .....		365
George Willner .....		376
Morris Carnovsky.....		389
<b>April 25, 1951:</b>		
Testimony of—		
Abraham Lincoln Polonsky.....		396
Edward Dmytryk.....		408
<b>May 16, 1951:</b>		
Testimony of—		
Leonardo Bercovici.....		441
Alvin Hammer.....		451
Bea Winters.....		458
<b>May 17, 1951:</b>		
Testimony of—		
Lloyd Gough.....		463
Thad Page.....		471
Leonardo Bercovici (resumed).....		472
Roy M. Brewer.....		473
<b>May 18, 1951:</b>		
Testimony of Roy M. Brewer (resumed).....		495





## COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION- PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 2

---

TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1951

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

### PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment at 10:30 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, Harold H. Velde, and Donald L. Jackson.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; William A. Wheeler, investigator; John W. Carrington, clerk; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. WOOD. Let the committee be in order.

Let the record show, please, that there are present the following members of the committee: Mr. Walter, Mr. Moulder, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Velde, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Wood, a majority of the full committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call as the first witness this morning Mr. Sam Moore.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moore, will you raise your right hand, please, and be sworn. You solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MOORE. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF SAM MOORE, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, MARTIN POPPER

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your full name, please?

Mr. MOORE. Sam Moore.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. POPPER. Martin Popper, 160 Broadway, New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Moore, will you state when and where you were born?

Mr. MOORE. I was born in Flushing, N. Y., in November 1904.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present place of residence?

Mr. MOORE. 444 Central Park West, New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. MOORE. I am a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give to the committee, please, a brief statement of your educational training?

Mr. MOORE. I went to grade schools all over the country—in Cambridge, Mass.; Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Madison, Wis.; Ann Arbor, Mich. I went to high school 2 years in Ann Arbor, and finished my preparatory school work at Kent School, Kent, Conn. I went to the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor and took my A. B. degree.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee a brief statement of your employment record since the time of the completion of your education?

(Representative Harold H. Velde left hearing room.)

Mr. MOORE. I worked in the advertising business in New York from about 1925 to 1930. In 1931, I became a reporter on the New York Herald Tribune under Stanley Walker. After that I became a radio writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the approximate date when you became a radio writer?

Mr. MOORE. I think it was toward the end of 1931. I was employed by the J. Walter Thompson Advertising Co. and worked for them until 1936. I worked for them in New York until 1934; then they sent me to Hollywood, and I worked there until 1936.

In 1936, I left them to go with the William Este Agency. I left them in 1937 and have been a free-lance writer ever since. I wrote for radio until 1947. From 1942 to 1947, I wrote in collaboration a program called The Great Gildersleeve.

I stopped radio in 1947 and came to New York because of a legitimate show that I was one of the authors of. I did one radio show in New York in the summer of 1949. In the autumn of 1949 Texas L'il Darlin' was produced on Broadway. I have done a little television since.

(Representative Harold H. Velde returned to hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand that you left Hollywood about 1947?

Mr. MOORE. No, sir. I left Hollywood just for the summer in 1949, and then I left again last summer and have been here since.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you first go to Hollywood?

Mr. MOORE. In February 1934.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were in Hollywood, were you a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. MOORE. I was an associate member of the Screen Writers' Guild for a very short time when I did work in pictures.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold any position in the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. MOORE. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the period during which you were associated with the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. MOORE. I believe it was during 1937.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just for the period of the 1 year, do you mean?

Mr. MOORE. Probably. I only worked in pictures about 6 or 8 weeks, and I don't think I kept up my membership in the Screen Writers' Guild after I went back to radio.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. MOORE. Hollywood Writers' Mobilization is one of the organizations that this committee has classified as a subversive organization, and I decline to answer this question on the grounds it may tend to incriminate me, the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, as I understand, you decline to answer any question relating to the conduct of the business of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your ground for refusal to answer questions relating to that organization?

Mr. MOORE. The fact that although this organization—the fact that this organization, whether it is in that book or not, has been attacked by this committee and other groups as a so-called subversive group, and for me to answer questions about it, I feel would tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Radio Writers' Guild?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. During what period of time were you a member of that guild?

Mr. MOORE. I have some dates on that. From about 1938 or 1939 until the present time, including the present time.

Mr. TAVENNER. What official positions have you held with the Radio Writers' Guild?

Mr. MOORE. I served on the council of the western region of the guild in Hollywood from 1940 to 1943. I was vice president in charge of the western region in 1943 and 1944. I was national president of the guild in 1945 and 1946. And in 1947 and 1948 I served two more terms as western vice president. In 1949 I was reelected to the council of the western region. In 1950 I moved to New York and was elected to the council of the eastern region.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Radio Writers' Guild support financially the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. MOORE. I have already declined to answer questions relating to the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, and it seems to me this is another question of the same kind which I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the testimony of Mr. Richard Collins, one of the projects of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization was the dissemination of information relating to atomic energy, and to that end there was established within the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization a group known as the "Atomic Energy Commission." Were you affiliated in any way with the activities of the "Atomic Energy Commission" of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. MOORE. That is the same type of question as the other question. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a group within the Radio Writers' Guild that was interested in the dissemination of information of that same character?

Mr. MOORE. I decline to answer—Will you repeat the question, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the question, please.

(The question referred to was read by the reporter, as follows: "Was there a group within the Radio Writers' Guild that was interested in the dissemination of information of that same character?")

Mr. MOORE. Could you make that question a little more specific?

Mr. TAVENNER. I could not help but overhear, from even at this distance, what appeared to be prompting of your answer about making it more specific. I do not believe that counsel should indicate to the witness what answers to make, but of course you are free, as the chairman will advise you, to confer with your counsel at all times.

Mr. POPPER. I object to the comment because it is inconsistent with the fact. There was no such statement made by counsel.

Mr. WOOD. The witness has a right to confer with his counsel at any time he desires.

Mr. POPPER. However, I would like my objection noted because it is contrary to the fact.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did not counsel make the statement to you, when I first asked the question, to ask that it be made more specific?

Mr. MOORE. He did not use the word "specific," no, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What word did he use?

Mr. MOORE. I don't remember, but he didn't say that.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was the meaning of it, wasn't it?

Mr. POPPER. I object to that on the ground this constitutes legitimate advice of counsel.

Mr. WOOD. The committee does not permit objections.

Mr. POPPER. I appreciate that, but the witness is being badgered about legitimate advice of counsel.

Mr. WOOD. The witness is merely being asked a question, and it is the view of the chairman that the questions asked are not a badgering.

Mr. TAVENNER. My question to you was whether or not there was within the Radio Writers' Guild a group which was interested in the dissemination of information relating to atomic energy?

Mr. MOORE. I still think it is a vague question.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would seem to me to be an easy question for you to answer.

Mr. MOORE. I consider it a vague and airy question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I will try to make it a little more specific for you. Were you interested, as a member of the Radio Writers' Guild, in the dissemination of information to the public relating to atomic energy?

Mr. MOORE. As a member of the Radio Writers' Guild?

Mr. TAVENNER. Either as a member or not as a member.

Mr. MOORE. It seems to me you are just trying to connect me again with this organization, Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, which you have declared or attempted to define as a subversive organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am only endeavoring to get such facts from you as I am able to get concerning your experience in Hollywood and the various organizations with which you were affiliated.

Mr. MOORE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there an organization within the Radio Writers' Guild which interested itself in the dissemination of information relating to atomic energy?

Mr. MOORE. It seems to me this is the same type of question. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. WALTER. Was he asked the question of whether or not he was a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; and admitted he was.



Mr. POPPER. Do you mean Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. TAVENNER. Radio Writers' Guild.

Mr. MOORE. I understood he said Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. I may have misunderstood the question. You have stated you were a member of the Radio Writers' Guild and the various positions you have held in the guild?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; and I am very proud of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you are unwilling to state to this committee to what extent they were active or interested in the dissemination of information relating to atomic energy?

Mr. MOORE. I have declined to answer that question; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of a committee known as the Radio Advisory Committee of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. MOORE. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. WALTER. Before you get away from that, what was the name of that organization, Radio Writers'—

Mr. TAVENNER. Radio Advisory Committee of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization.

Mr. WALTER. Do you decline to answer that question on the ground that to answer it might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. That organization has never been listed as a subversive, Communist, or Communist-front organization?

Mr. MOORE. The question was of a committee of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, and the Mobilization has been classified by this committee as a subversive organization.

Mr. POPPER. If the chairman permits me to, I will be glad to refer you to the page.

Mr. WOOD. Let's have an understanding so that we may avoid further interruptions. Counsel is privileged at this hearing to advise his client, not the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Moore, the official publication of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, known as Communiqué, in its March 1945 issue reported that the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization was planning a series of 26 radio plays regarding the problems of returning soldiers. Were you on a board of five charged with the responsibility of getting scripts approved and into production relating to that series of radio programs?

Mr. MOORE. This is another question that would connect me with the Mobilization, and I decline to answer for the same reasons as stated before.

Mr. WOOD. May I interrupt at this point, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Your refusal to answer the question a while ago was predicated on the statement you made that the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization had been classified by this committee as a subversive organization. I call attention to the fact that that statement is not borne out by the facts.

Mr. MOORE. Maybe it isn't this committee, but it is in the list issued by the committee in March.

Mr. WOOD. It was cited by the Attorney General of the United States. Would that fact alter the witness' position on answering the question?

Mr. MOORE. No, sir; it would not.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a member of the Radio Writers' Guild, were you active in procuring the use of a broadcast station, a radio station?

Mr. MOORE. Not that I recall. Could you make that question more specific?

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you interested in obtaining the approval of the Federal Communications Commission to set up a radio station in behalf of the Hollywood Community Club, Inc.?

Mr. MOORE. I think I know what you are referring to, Mr. Tavenner. I took part in a—may I see the book? Are you referring to the Hollywood Community Radio Group, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. I suppose that is it; yes.

Mr. MOORE. That is listed on page 56 of this book as a subversive organization, and I decline to answer questions relating to it for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, the witness has given several reasons for refusing to answer these questions, that they were vague and uncertain and that the organization about which they were asked was listed in this guide. I would like to get it clear, what is your ground for refusal to answer the question?

Mr. MOORE. The ground is the fear, my fear, that an answer to the question might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. VELDE. That is all.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been testimony before this committee by Mr. Richard Collins to the effect that the Communist Party was interested in the project of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization of disseminating information regarding atomic energy. To your knowledge, was there a like interest, or interest of any kind, exhibited by the Communist Party in the dissemination of the same type of information by means of radio, through the help of the Radio Writers' Guild or any groups within it?

Mr. MOORE. This question is the same type of question. I refuse to answer this question on the same grounds as before.

Mr. TAVENNER. That to answer the question might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get it clear, if I may: You have stated you belonged to an organization you say you are very proud of.

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Do I understand it is your contention that to answer "yes" or "no" to a question of whether, to the best of your knowledge, the Communist Party tried to use that organization, would tend to incriminate you?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Moore, do you know whether there was a group within the Communist Party known as the Radio Club of the Communist Party in Hollywood during the year 1944?

Mr. MOORE. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds as previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Motion Picture and Radio Commission of the Los Angeles County Communist Political Association?

Mr. MOORE. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Moore, the American Youth for Democracy is an organization that was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, and by the Committee on Un-American Activities on April 17, 1947. Did you make any substantial contribution to that organization after it was first cited and with knowledge that it had been cited as a Communist Party front?

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left hearing room.)

Mr. MOORE. I don't see the point of asking me about these one after another. I decline to answer that question also on the same ground. There are hundreds of organizations listed in your book, and there are millions of members who have been proud to be members, and this committee has made it impossible to answer this type of question without the possibility of incrimination.

Mr. WALTER. Do you think the listing of these organizations has in anywise caused a decline of interest in the organizations and affected the membership?

Mr. MOORE. I think the listing of such organization is an attempt to intimidate members and nonmembers from joining that organization.

Mr. WALTER. Has it had that effect?

Mr. MOORE. I think it has tended to have that effect. I think, for example, your listing of a number of peace organizations was certainly not an encouragement to people who organized for peace.

Mr. VELDE. Are you through?

Mr. WALTER. No; I would like to follow it a little further. You think the release of the names of these organizations that purportedly are for the promotion of peace affected membership drives and perhaps affected the ability of the sponsors of those movements to raise funds?

Mr. MOORE. I don't know of my own knowledge, but I think it would be probable that that would be the result. The result naturally would be to frighten people away from making any kind of organized effort for peace.

Mr. WALTER. If that is what was accomplished, I think the committee has made a substantial contribution to peace in America.

Mr. MOORE. I don't know what you mean by "contribution." My idea is, peace is peace.

Mr. WALTER. Even if it means surrender and the peace of Alcatraz? That is peace.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde, did you have any questions?

Mr. VELDE. Yes. You stated an answer to various questions asked you would tend to incriminate you. Has the committee ever, to your knowledge, incriminated or caused incrimination of any witness who has come here and answered questions truthfully?

Mr. MOORE. I don't know, sir.

Mr. VELDE. I can tell you definitely, if you don't know, that it has not and never will. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at one time on the editorial staff of the Hollywood Quarterly, which was a magazine sponsored by the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. MOORE. This is a question in which the committee is tampering with the freedom of the press. Hollywood Quarterly is listed also

as a subversive publication by your committee, and I decline to answer this question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were John Howard Lawson and Ed Dmytryk also on the editorial staff of that publication?

Mr. MOORE. Will you repeat that question?

Mr. TAVENNER. I will strike "also."

Mr. MOORE. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were John Howard Lawson and Ed Dmytryk on the editorial staff of the Hollywood Quarterly?

Mr. MOORE. I decline to answer for the same reason stated before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time attend a meeting in 1945 to discuss what is known as the Duclos letter?

Mr. MOORE. I decline to answer this question for the same reason as previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Moore, the committee has information that you were a member of the Communist Party in 1944 and 1945, and that you held a Communist Party card, registration card, bearing No. 47288 for the year 1945. Is that information correct?

Mr. MOORE. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party and are you a member now?

Mr. MOORE. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Moore, with reference to Radio Writers' Guild, I think you volunteered the information that you were national president in 1945?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. And then that you were vice president a couple times, and very proud of your membership, and were elected to the council of the western and also the eastern region?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I have looked in the book to which you referred, both in the index, at page 155, and throughout this book I think you referred to as published in March of this year, and I don't find that organization listed. Is it your claim that it is listed?

Mr. MOORE. No, sir. Radio Writers' Guild is a trade-union that is one of the best in the entertainment industry, and I am very proud of it. It is not in your book.

Mr. DOYLE. Didn't I understand that you refused to answer a question or two committee counsel asked you about the functioning of that Radio Writers' Guild in connection with atomic energy, if anything, and you refused to answer on the same ground you had before?

Mr. MOORE. I believe I declined to answer a question that had to do with the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization.

Mr. DOYLE. I misunderstood, then, counsel's question. May I ask you this, then: Did the Radio Writers' Guild, of which you were a member—I believe you said you still are?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Did the Radio Writers' Guild have any committee which was interested in the dissemination of information about atomic energy?

Mr. MOORE. I don't recall any such committee; no, sir.



Mr. DOYLE. Did that Radio Writers' Guild make financial contributions to any organization which was interested in informing the American people on any subject in connection with atomic energy?

Mr. MOORE. That question I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. DOYLE. If the organization about which I am asking you is not listed in any way, why would anything it did be, in your judgment, apt to incriminate you? It is not listed as subversive group. I am not asking you about any other group. I am asking you about this one group.

Mr. MOORE. You are asking a question that it seems to me is an attempt to tie me up with other organizations. I decline to answer for this reason.

Mr. DOYLE. Maybe you are trying to anticipate what I am going to ask, but you might be mistaken, you see.

Mr. MOORE. I will stand on my answer.

Mr. DOYLE. I am not trying to trap you. I am interested in trying to get your philosophy as to why you think answering a question as to the Radio Writers' Guild would incriminate you when it is not listed in any way in any subversive group.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. MOORE. Counsel has given me some kind of legal advice I don't understand, but I stand on my answer.

Mr. DOYLE. Do I understand that you heard your counsel and still don't understand him?

Mr. MOORE. I heard the finish.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. One more question. Do I understand your position to be substantially this: That, if you were asked any question by counsel or by one of the members of the committee with reference to any subject as to the activities or objectives or purposes or functioning of any group listed in this book published by the committee on March 3, 1951, you would refuse to answer on the grounds that it might incriminate you?

Mr. MOORE. I guess that is substantially right; yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, the reason I asked you that was not to trap you. I notice you have refused to answer any question that was asked you about any organization or committee listed in this book. May I ask you this question: Do I understand then that your refusal to answer my question about the Radio Writers' Guild, which you have stated you this question: Do I understand then that your refusal to answer in 1945, is because you feel that your answer to that question might directly or indirectly lead you into being asked about the functioning of any of these groups that are listed as subversive in this book?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Moore, in the course of your preparation of scripts for radio, television, and the theater, did you ever do anything on the atomic bomb or the horrors of it? Did you write anything about the use of the atomic bomb?

Mr. MOORE. Not that I recall; no, sir.

Mr. WALTER. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. I notice you declined to answer some questions with reference to the activities of the Hollywood Quarterly on the ground that it appeared in this guide the committee has issued. The Hollywood Quarterly has been cited as a Communist-front organization by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in 1948. Does that information alter your position on answering the questions concerning its activities?

Mr. MOORE. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions, counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Is there reason why this witness cannot be excused from further attendance?

Mr. TAVENNER. I know of none, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. You are excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Harold Buchman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Buchman, will you hold up your right hand and be sworn.

You solemnly swear the testimony you give before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF HAROLD BUCHMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, R. LAWRENCE SIEGEL

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Harold Buchman?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that your full name?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record.

Mr. SIEGEL. R. Lawrence Siegel, of Pepper & Siegel, 55 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y.

Mr. Chairman, will you indulge me to make a motion for a few seconds? I will be very brief.

Mr. WOOD. A motion?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Of what nature?

Mr. SIEGEL. I would like to move to vacate the subpoena on several legal grounds, sir. It will take about 2 seconds if you want to indulge me.

Mr. WOOD. Let's inquire of the witness first if he has been subpoenaed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you responded here today in answer to a subpoena served on you?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIEGEL. May I proceed, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WOOD. The witness has been subpoenaed. This is not the proper forum in which to attack the validity of a subpoena. The committee's

only recourse in presenting witnesses is by its subpoenas. If it should become necessary in some future time to attack the validity of it, there is a proper forum in which to do it. My view of it is that this is not the proper forum. However, if you have a written motion there you may file it.

Mr. SIEGEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Buchman, will you state, please, when and where you were born?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Brainerd, Minn., June 24, 1912.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present place of residence?

Mr. BUCHMAN. 607 North Crescent Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Screen writer.

Mr. VELDE. Would the witness speak up?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Screen writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state briefly to the committee what your educational training has been.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, my family moved to New York when I was about 8. I went through the New York public school system. I graduated from George Washington High School in 1929. The fall of that year I entered the University of Pennsylvania and I stayed there 4 years, until I received an A. B. degree in 1933.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee briefly your employment record since the completion of your education.

Mr. BUCHMAN. I have never known any other profession except screen writing. I went to Hollywood, oh, perhaps 6 months after graduation from college.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would be in what year?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Either the very end of 1933 or the beginning of 1944. I don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean the beginning of 1934?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Did I say 1944? I mean 1934. And I wrote stories without success for a year or so, finally sold a very important—unimportant, I should say—story, and on the basis of it I obtained a job at Columbia Pictures, where I stayed for about 3 years, writing dozens and dozens of what we call program pictures in celluloid—low budget films.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the approximate dates? You said for a period of 3 years.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Oh, from about 1935 through a good deal of 1938 I worked exclusively at Columbia. In 1939 I worked at Universal. At Universal I did several films. In 1940 I went to Fox, 20th Century Fox, and I think all of my Hollywood employment for the next 4 or 5 years was at 20th Century Fox. I was under contract.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you living during that period of time, from 1940 up through 1945?

Mr. BUCHMAN. In a community not far from Beverly Hills called Westwood—called West Los Angeles. I think the exact street was Homedale Street.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the number of your residence?

Mr. BUCHMAN. It had 5 numbers. I think it was 11132. I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. You worked there until 1945, and then from 1945 what was your employment?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I worked at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer following that. I worked at Metro, I believe, from December of 1945 until about June of 1947. Possibly May of 1947. My next employment was at Twentieth Century Fox. In 1948 I worked at Fox for a brief time. I then had no employment for, oh, almost a year. My next job was at Paramount in 1949. I worked at Paramount from 1949, September, to I believe about March of 1950. I have not been employed since except for a couple of weeks at Columbia for my brother, who produces there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your brother's name is Sidney, I believe?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Sidney Buchman. And save for those few weeks, I have not been employed since I left Paramount.

Mr. TAVENNER. During this period of time when you worked in Hollywood as a screen writer, were you a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What official positions have you held in the Screen Writers' Guild, and the approximate dates?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I know that I have been a member of the executive board.

Mr. WOOD. Will you please elevate your voice?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I have been a member of the executive board. What years, I could not say. I have served in the guild for so many years on committees, like credit union, arbitration, and what not, that I would really be hard pressed to say. Possibly in 1945 and 1946, in those years, I was a member of the board. I know that I was a member of the board. In fact, I was treasurer for a couple of years of the guild. I was elected to the board in October of 1949 and served until—served a full year until October, I think, was the election date in the guild, of 1950. I hold no office in the guild now.

Mr. TAVENNER. You apparently were on the executive board or possibly the treasurer at about the time that the issue arose as to whether or not the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization should continue to receive the support of the guild. What can you tell us about that?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully decline to answer that question, under the fifth amendment, on the ground that it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then do I understand that you refuse to answer any question that I might ask you regarding your knowledge of the operations of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I merely feel, Mr. Chairman, that in the context of this hearing, in relation to certain matters which I feel I don't have to acquaint you with, that I don't feel compelled, or rather I feel that I cannot in any way be asked to provide any kind of evidence against myself in terms of names or facts or any shred of evidence which might be used against me in a prosecution. I deplore the—

Mr. WOOD. Is it your thought, sir, that to answer questions involving the activities of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization might have such a tendency to incriminate you?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, sir, I do.

Mr. WOOD. And is it for that reason that you decline to answer any questions concerning the operation of that organization?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, sir.



Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion to travel outside the continental limits of the United States at any time during the period you were in Hollywood as a screen writer?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, sir. I went to Europe for about 5 months, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. What countries did you visit?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I visited first England. From England I took a boat to the Soviet Union. From there I went to Austria. From Austria I went to Italy. From Italy I went to France. From France I went to Switzerland, back to Austria to ski. I then went to Paris, back to London again, and then home.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you in the Soviet Union?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I think 5 or 6 weeks.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your purpose in going?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I think I'd describe it as a grand tour, a trip throughout Europe that I was always wanting to make. I had saved just enough money to make it. I was single.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of the trip?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I think I left New York in August and returned in February, although—

Mr. TAVENNER. Of what year?

Mr. BUCHMAN. 1937 to 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were your expenses paid entirely by yourself or was there a contribution from any source toward your expenses?

Mr. BUCHMAN. None whatsoever. All my own. I was purely a tourist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated with the People's Educational Center?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I must decline to answer that, sir, on the grounds I previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Buchman, the committee has information that you held Communist Political Association card No. 46802 for the year 1944, and a Communist Party card for the year 1945 bearing the number 47174, which bore the address 11232 Homedale. Is that correct?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I must decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time, and are you a member now?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I must decline to answer that question on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Buchman, you related that you were a member of the Hollywood Writers' Guild. As I recall it, that group is not listed as subversive, is it, in the book issued March 3, 1951?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I was not asked any questions about the Screen Writers' Guild, sir, except in relation to a matter which gives me a sense of apprehension about incrimination.

(Representative Francis E. Walter left the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, you do not find the Hollywood Screen Writers' Guild listed, do you, in this book referred to?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I find the Mobilization, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. What page is that on?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Fifty-seven.

Mr. DOYLE. The Hollywood Writers' Mobilization is listed as the third item on page 57. I am not asking you about that, sir. I am asking you or going to ask you briefly about the Hollywood Screen Writers' Guild. Are they one and the same? Is that why you don't answer?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No. It is merely the context of the question, Mr. Doyle. They are not the same, except that I feel that very likely in the near future they could be the same.

Mr. DOYLE. Because of the similarity?

Mr. BUCHMAN. No, because of certain testimony and a long history in Hollywood, which I feel because of my election in 1949—that I feel like a candidate who is impervious to political winds. I feel that I was very honored in 1949 that the guild looked upon me as an individual and considered that I owed no loyalty to any other organization except the guild.

Mr. DOYLE. Then do you feel if I asked you any question about the functioning of the Hollywood Screen Writers' Guild that you would be compelled to decline to answer because you think it might incriminate you? I don't want to waste your time and the committee's time if that is going to be your answer.

Mr. SEGEL. May I ask a question for clarification, which I think may simplify it. When you say "Hollywood Screen Writers' Guild," Congressman Doyle, do you mean the Screen Writers' Guild? I think that is what is confusing the witness.

(Representative Francis E. Walter returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. I refer to the Screen Writers' Guild. What would be your answer to that? Do you feel that if I asked you any question about the Screen Writers' Guild that you would be compelled in your own conscience to refuse to answer on the grounds that it might incriminate you? It is not listed, as near as I can see, in this book, is it?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I just honestly feel, Mr. Doyle, that it would be difficult for you to ask a question in which I could not sense a line of inquiry that I feel might lead to some future prosecution of myself. This is a regrettable situation. I certainly didn't cause it.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you ever read the law or has your counsel informed you of what the jurisdiction of this committee is and the purpose of this hearing?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I have a general understanding of it; yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. What is your understanding of it? Do you understand my question?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. I am asking you, frankly, as one American to another: What do you understand the jurisdiction of this committee is at this sort of a hearing this morning?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, like many congressional committees, a committee attempting to get information, the end product of which is legislation.

Mr. DOYLE. Legislation for what purpose?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I don't know. That is the big problem, Mr. Doyle. I would like to say this: I have known of you for a long time and applauded your election many years ago, and sitting in this room was impressed with your own sincere desire to understand what is going on here. I don't think we have any argument, Mr. Doyle, about force and violence. I think it is a political doctrine that is—well,

in a country that has had 150 years of democratic processes, I have never envisioned any change for this country which could not be achieved within that document, the Constitution.

Mr. DOYLE. In view of the observation that you have just made—that you felt I was sincere in my committee approach to these problems—I wish to say that I think all members of this committee are sincere in trying to do the job we are assigned to do. I take it, therefore, you haven't had the time to read this assignment under the bill which the committee functions under, which is Public Law 601.

May I ask you this: Wouldn't you feel it is the duty and responsibility of this committee to examine into the extent and character and objectives of subversive conduct in this country, if we were assigned to do that by Congress?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Yes, sir. Sitting there last week I accepted your Webster definition of "subversive," but beyond that point—and this is where we get into trouble, and I speak as someone who considers himself no less loyal than any man in this room in combating a forceful overthrow of this country in an armed conflict. I would bear arms in defense of this country. But beyond that, Mr. Doyle, there are many questions of what this country is. I mean what it embodies. I think that my opinion of this committee may not be worth anything because the accusation could be made that, singled out by it, I am very prejudiced and that my opinion is worth nothing. But I could find a stack of very conservative opinion, Mr. Doyle, to the effect that this committee is not a good committee.

(Representative Harold H. Velde entered the hearing room.)

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask you this question with reference to the Screen Writers' Guild. From your answers in the record, it is very apparent that the Screen Writers' Guild is not listed as subversive by this committee or any records that this committee has published. May I ask you this in connection with the functioning of the Screen Writers' Guild. Are you a member of the Screen Writers' Guild now?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I couldn't say. I haven't been in Hollywood in a number of weeks. I assume I am. I haven't been notified that my membership was terminated.

Mr. DOYLE. At any time during the time you were active as a member of the Screen Writers' Guild, were you aware in your own belief, from understanding the situation, of any effort, either direct or indirect, on the part of the Communist Party in the United States to gain any control, either by election of officers or committees, of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I must decline to answer that question, Mr. Doyle, because of the obvious placing of it.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course, I am deliberately placing it to find out whether or not the Screen Writers' Guild, which is not listed as subversive, was an object of desire on the part of the Communist Party of the United States as one of the groups they wanted to control. That is the purpose of my question. I am not asking you whether you were a member of the Communist Party or not, sir.

Mr. BUCHMAN. Well, I am trying to be a truthful witness, Mr. Doyle. I feel that an honest declination to answer under the fifth amendment is a very old and good answer. It is the only one I can give.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Whom did you go to work for in 1949 at Paramount?

Mr. BUCHMAN. A man named Milton Holmes.

Mr. JACKSON. Milton Holmes?

Mr. BUCHMAN. H-o-l-m-e-s.

Mr. JACKSON. What agency are you connected with?

Mr. BUCHMAN. At that time it was the Willner-Goldstone agency, which I had for about a year. Prior to that it was the Mary Baker, and for many years a man named Lucien Swanson.

Mr. JACKSON. Am I correct that in 1948 you were at 20th Century Fox?

Mr. BUCHMAN. That's correct.

Mr. JACKSON. What scripts did you do during that time?

Mr. BUCHMAN. I wrote a story about psychosomatic medicine for a man named Kaufman—a comedy. We sold it to 20th, and we went to work on the screen play, which I hear is now on the shelf. There are so many. It has never been produced.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions by counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason why this witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

The next witness is Anne Revere.

Mr. WOOD. Will you please raise your right hand.

You do solemnly swear the testimony you give before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss REVERE. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF ANNE REVERE, ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, R. LAWRENCE SIEGEL

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your full name, please.

Miss REVERE. Anne Revere.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are represented by counsel?

Miss REVERE. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record.

Mr. SIEGEL. R. Lawrence Siegel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give your address too, please.

Mr. SIEGEL. Fifty-five Liberty Street, New York 5, N. Y.

Mr. Chairman, may I file a motion to vacate the subpoena in behalf of this witness?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss Revere, will you please state the place of your birth.

Miss REVERE. Thank you for not asking me when. I was born in New York City. Occasionally I play grandmothers, and it might jeopardize my professional standing.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your place of residence?

Miss REVERE. 2511 Bowmont, Beverly Hills, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?



Miss REVERE. I like to think of myself as an actress.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please state in a general way your educational background.

Miss REVERE. I was educated in the grammar schools and high schools of Westfield, N. J., and went from there immediately to Wellesley College, from which I graduated, receiving my B. A. degree in 1926.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your record of engagements as an actress, briefly?

Miss REVERE. Spotty, like all actresses.

Mr. TAVENNER. For whom have you worked?

Miss REVERE. Are you just interested in motion pictures, or would you like my theater history?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Miss REVERE. I began in the theater many years ago. I presume that my most successful plays were Double Door and The Children's Hour, in which I had an extended engagement. I also established or helped to establish a theater, which I owned and operated, in Surrey, Maine. Subsequently, in 1934, I first came to Hollywood to do the picture version of Double Door, and then went back to New York. I have for approximately 11 years, I would say, been a resident of California, and during a great portion of that time employed in the studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. About what year did your residence in California begin?

Miss REVERE. Approximately, I think it was January 1940, as nearly as I remember?

Mr. TAVENNER. While in Hollywood were you a member of Actors' Laboratory, Inc., or affiliated with it in any way?

Miss REVERE. Mr. Tavenner and gentlemen, this would seem to me, based upon my observation in the course of the week in which I have listened to these testimonies, to be the first in a possible series of questions which would attempt in some manner to link me with subversive organizations; and as the Communist Party is a political party—legal political party—in this country today, and as I consider any questioning regarding one's political views or religious views as a violation of the rights of a citizen under our Constitution, and as I would consider myself, therefore, contributing to the overthrow of our form of government as I understand it if I were to assist you in violating this privilege of mine and other citizens of this country, I respectfully decline to answer this question on the basis of the fifth amendment, possible self-incrimination, and also the first amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss Revere, the committee is in possession of information to the effect that you were the holder of a Communist Party registration card for the year 1945, bearing the number 47346, and that you also held a card for the year 1944, which bore the number 46937. Is that correct?

Miss REVERE. Could I see the card, gentlemen?

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recognize that card [handing document to witness]?

Miss REVERE. As this would in effect constitute an answer to a question which I have already declined to answer for the reasons given, namely, that it is an invasion of the privileges and rights of a citizen,



I would respectfully decline to answer this question on the basis of possible self-incrimination. However, I do not——

Mr. WOOD. Do you refuse to answer for that reason?

Miss REVERE. Yes.

Mr. SIEGEL. May I consult with the witness for a moment, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss Revere, the committee also has information in the form of sworn testimony that you were a member of the Communist Party in Hollywood. Do you desire to either affirm or deny that statement?

Miss REVERE. Again, Mr. Tavenner, I would claim my privilege under the fifth amendment and respectfully decline to answer such a question, on the basis of possible self-incrimination.

Mr. WOOD. Is it on that basis that you decline to answer?

Miss REVERE. Could I enlarge upon that answer, Mr. Wood? I would like to.

Mr. WOOD. I just want to know if that is your reason for not answering.

Miss REVERE. That is my reason.

Mr. WOOD. That is all the committee is interested in.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Miss REVERE. It would seem to me, Mr. Tavenner, that that is another——

Mr. WOOD. Just answer or decline to answer.

Miss REVERE. I decline again, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Communist Party at this time?

Miss REVERE. That I also respectfully decline to answer, for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. The name Ann Revere is your professional name, is it not?

Miss REVERE. It is my professional name. It is also the name which I was baptized with in the Presbyterian Church of Westfield, N. J.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been married?

Miss REVERE. I am at present married; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your husband's name?

Miss REVERE. Samuel Rossen.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you married?

Miss REVERE. 1935; April 11.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter?

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason why this witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think not.

Mr. WOOD. You are excused.

Miss REVERE. Thank you. Could I say—

Mr. WOOD. You are excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Wheeler.

Mr. WOOD. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn.

You solemnly swear the testimony you give before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WHEELER. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM A. WHEELER

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your full name, please?

Mr. WHEELER. William A. Wheeler.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Wheeler, are you employed as an investigator by the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been so employed?

Mr. WHEELER. It will be 4 years this coming August.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Wheeler, were you directed to serve various subpoenas in California for the attendance of prospective witnesses at this hearing?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. By "this hearing" I do not necessarily confine it to today, but I mean the Hollywood hearings.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I wish you would state to the committee what difficulty, if any, you have had in serving those subpoenas, and be specific as to names and as to the circumstances.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Andrews and I were assigned by this committee to serve approximately 30 subpoenas.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who is Mr. Andrews?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Andrews is also an investigator of this committee—on approximately 30 individuals in Hollywood. During the course of this assignment we were in Hollywood on two separate occasions, the first from February 21 to March 17, 1951, and again from April 1 to April 8 of this year. During this period of time Mr. Andrews and I made a diligent effort in a search for these individuals. A number of subpoenas were served. We also had the assistance of the United States marshal's office in the serving of subpoenas.

I would like to bring to the committee's attention the following cases in which we had difficulty.

The first was the case of Michael Uris. He resides at 3276 DeRonda Drive, Los Angeles, Calif. Mr. Uris is not presently employed by any studio and is listed as a free lance screen writer. On the 24th of February the home of Mr. Uris was contacted in an effort to serve the subpoena. The maid answered the door and advised that Mr. Uris was ill at the time. Mrs. Uris then came to the door and stated that her husband was sick with a virus infection. Mrs. Uris stated that she would go upstairs and talk the matter over with her husband, which she did. She returned and stated that her husband was too ill to accept service and to call again on the following Monday, which would be February 26. She absolutely refused admittance

to see Mr. Uris and promised to see that the service of the subpoena would be expedited the following Monday.

On the following Monday the home of Mr. Uris was again visited, and Mrs. Uris advised that the doctors had sent Mr. Uris to the hospital and had instructed that he see no one. It was then requested that she obtain a statement from her doctor or doctors regarding the nature of her husband's illness. She declined to name the name of the doctor or the hospital to which her husband was sent. She stated that she would contact the doctor and advise us the following day.

The following day, through the cooperation of a local law-enforcement agency, all the hospitals in Los Angeles area were checked, with negative results. The Uris residence was again contacted, and Mrs. Uris advised that she had sent her husband out of town to recuperate, and he had not gone to a hospital.

(Representative Francis E. Walter left the hearing room.)

Mr. WHEELER. The subpoena for Mr. Uris originally called for his appearance here on the 21st day of March, 1951.

Prior to leaving Los Angeles, we left the subpoena with the United States marshal. On our second trip to Hollywood we again contacted the home of Michael Uris and found no one at home.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. Do you know whether the United States marshal made any effort to serve the subpoena?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, sir, they did. I have some evidence that I would like to bring in at a later time regarding all these witnesses.

The second person that we have had some difficulty with is Georgia Backus Alexander. This individual is a radio writer and is known professionally as Georgia Backus. She resides with her husband at 6149 Fulton Avenue, Van Nuys, Calif. On the 24th of February the home of Georgia Backus was contacted, at which time we talked to her husband, Harmon Alexander. He refused to permit his wife to accept service of the subpoena by not permitting her to leave the house. He stated that he wanted to discuss the matter with his lawyer, and we requested that he do so at once. He made an effort to contact the lawyer but stated that he could not be located, and wanted us to contact him again the following Monday. We contacted him the following Monday by telephone, and he advised that his lawyer was a Mr. Esterman, 6513 Hollywood Boulevard, and that Mr. Esterman would arrange to accept service of the subpoena or make Mrs. Backus available. He was contacted, and he stated that he had not been retained by the subject but would ascertain his position in the matter and let us know the following day, on Tuesday. Mr. Esterman was again contacted, and he advised that he did not represent the subject and for us to attempt to serve the subpoena in the normal manner. Mr. Alexander was again contacted, and he advised that his wife had gone out of town, and he declined to give any information as to her whereabouts. The United States marshal's office made an effort to serve this subpoena and failed. The original subpoena issued for her called for appearance before this committee on March 22, 1951. Prior to leaving Los Angeles, we left the subpoena with the United States marshal's office, which is at the present time outstanding.

The next individual is Fred Rinaldo, of 14078 Davana Terrace, Sherman Oaks, Calif. He has also been successful in avoiding the service of a subpoena. Mr. Rinaldo is a free-lance screen writer and at the present time unemployed. I personally called at the home of Mr.

Rinaldo on various occasions and discussed the matter with his wife. The second time we called there we identified ourselves and gave the purpose for our visit. She stated that Mr. Rinaldo was out on the desert, that he had a virus infection and had gone out to recuperate, but she didn't know where he was, that he hadn't called her and she had no way of getting in contact with him whatsoever. This continued for a period of 3 weeks, calling at the home and discussing the matter with Mrs. Rinaldo and also the maid.

On April 6, during our second visit to California, we again called at the home of Mr. Rinaldo, and the maid answered the door. She stated that Mr. Rinaldo was still out on the desert, that she didn't know where he was, and that Mrs. Rinaldo was not home. The United States marshal's office or deputy United States marshal representing that office has also called at the home of Mr. Rinaldo on several occasions.

The next individual is Mr. Hugo Butler. He is a screen writer and also unemployed. He resides at 2002 North Serrano, Hollywood, Calif. During the week of February 26, 1951, we visited the home of Mr. Hugo Butler and were informed by his wife that Mr. Butler was expected home at 5:30. We did not identify ourselves at that time or the purpose of the visit. We called again the same day and were advised by his wife that she and Mr. Butler had some marital difficulty and that he had left the city. The marshal's office has also called on the home of Mr. Butler on numerous occasions, as well as Mr. Andrews and myself, without success. The last time we called was April 6, and there was no response when we rang the bell. Butler's original subpoena called for his appearance here in Washington on the 17th day of February. On February 14 a subpoena was left with the United States marshal, calling for his appearance here at a later date.

The next individual is Miss Karen Morley, an actress who resides at 2723 Laurel Canyon Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif. The home of Miss Morley was first visited during the week of February 26, 1951. In response to the ringing of the door bell an individual, also an actor, named Lloyd Gough, came to the door, and we talked to him regarding Miss Morley. He stated that she would be back later and to call later the same day. We did, and we called back on various occasions during our period there and found absolutely no one at home.

Mr. TAVENNER. About how many times did you call there?

Mr. WHEELER. I would say we visited Miss Morley's house more than we did anybody else's. She was closest to the hotel. I would say we were up there at least 20 times, and maybe more. We called again on April 6 and she was not at home.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the subpoena left with the United States marshal?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, sir; we left the subpoena with the United States marshal, and they also have attempted to serve Miss Morley, without result.

The next individual, Jack Berry, is a motion-picture director. He resides at 935 North Kings Road, Hollywood, Calif. On the day of February 24 we called at the home of Mr. Berry and talked to his wife. On this occasion the identity of the investigator was disclosed to Mrs. Berry. She advised that her husband was out and would not be home until late at night, and also that they were going away



for the week end, but Mr. Berry would be available the following Monday to accept service. As I recall, we called several times at the house that night, but without finding them at home. On the following Monday Mrs. Berry was contacted, and she advised that her husband was at home, but would not accept service of the subpoena until he had seen his lawyer. An appointment was arranged through Mrs. Berry to have Mr. Berry accept the service of the subpoena the following day at 2 p. m., and it was understood that should there be any changes in plans she would notify Mr. Andrews or myself at the hotel. Mr. Berry failed to keep the appointment and made no attempt to notify us of any change in plans. Subsequent attempts to contact the subject or his wife have met with no success. We visited the home of Mr. Berry on numerous occasions. The door was always answered by a lady who identified herself as a nurse, taking care of the children. She stated that the Berrys were out of town, didn't know when they would be back, or did not know how to locate them. On the 6th of April we again contacted the home of Mr. Berry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. About what age were the children, if the nurse didn't know how to locate the parents.

Mr. WHEELER. That I actually don't know, Mr. Tavenner; but it is my understanding that they are small children. I believe they have two.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you leave that subpoena with the marshal?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. The subpoena is with the marshal, Mr. Doyle.

On April 6 the home was again contacted by Mr. Andrews and me, and the maid related the same story, that the Berrys were out of town, she didn't know where they were, nor when she expected them back.

The next individual, Lew Solomon, is a screen writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that L-e-w?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; L-e-w S-o-l-o-m-o-n. He resides at 10513 Holman Avenue, West Los Angeles, Calif. Mr. Solomon's residence has been contacted repeatedly by the United States marshal in Los Angeles, Calif. He has talked both with Mrs. Solomon and the maid, and Mr. Solomon is just out of town and has been out of town for a period of 4 or 5 weeks, or left town shortly after Mr. Andrews and I arrived in Hollywood. The marshal has been unable to locate him. Mr. Andrews and I called at his home on April 6 and were advised by the maid that Mr. Solomon was out of town. She didn't know where he was nor when to expect him back, and Mrs. Solomon was also out.

The next individual is Leonardo Bercovici, 10520 Garwood Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. Mr. Bercovici is also a screen writer and is presently unemployed. Just prior to leaving Hollywood to return to Washington the first time, we received a telegram from Mr. Russell instructing us to serve Mr. Bercovici. We went to his home that night, accompanied by a deputy United States marshal, and I accompanied Mr. Sweeney to the door, who is the deputy marshal.

Mr. TAVENNER. Speak a little louder, please.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. William S. Sweeney, the deputy marshal.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you accompanied Mr. Sweeney to the door?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. A lady who identified herself as Mrs. Bercovici answered the door and stated her husband was not at home and didn't know exactly when he was going to return, that he



was at a conference. We didn't identify ourselves nor the purpose of our call. However, the following day Mrs. Bercovici was contacted again, and I identified myself as to who I was and the purpose of our call, and stated that it was necessary for Mr. Andrews and me to return to Washington, and that we had left a subpoena in the hands of the United States marshal. The marshal has been unable to serve the subpoena. On April 6 we again contacted the home of Mr. Bercovici, and no one was home. It was quite evident that no one had been there for a period of time, due to the newspapers and various other objects in the yard.

The last individual which I wish to bring to the committee's attention is Edward Huebsch. He resides at 11200 La Maida, Los Angeles, Calif. We received this subpoena rather late on our first trip to California, and when we received it we accompanied the United States marshal or deputy United States marshal to the home of Mr. Huebsch. The marshal talked to Mrs. Huebsch and was informed that her husband would be home later that same date. We stayed around the place until fairly late at night, and Mr. Huebsch did not return. Inquiries around the neighborhood disclosed that the next day Mrs. Huebsch loaded the station wagon up and left. No one has been there for the last 5 weeks. We contacted the residence again on April 6, and no one was at home. In regard to these individuals, I would like to bring to the attention of the committee a newspaper article appearing in the Los Angeles Examiner on Friday, March 23, 1951. That was shortly after Mr. Andrews and I left California. I would like to read this into the record:

Meanwhile, United States Marshal James Boyle announced that 10 more Hollywood figures are being sought to be subpoenaed to appear before the committee investigating communism in motion pictures at its next hearing April 10. They are Karen Morley—

Do you wish me to read the addresses in or just the names of the individuals?

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you should read the address as well as the name.

Mr. WHEELER (continuing)—

Karen Morley, 2723 Laurel Canyon Boulevard, actress, whose name figured in testimony before this committee Tuesday; Paul Jarrico, 320 Sherbourne Drive—

In response to this article, Mr. Jarrico contacted the marshal's office and stated that he was ready to accept service of the subpoena.

Fred Rinaldo, 14087 Davana Terrace, North Hollywood; Lew Solomon, 10513 Holman Avenue, West Los Angeles; Michael Uris, 3276 Deronde Drive; Georgia Backus Alexander, 6149 Fulton Avenue, Van Nuys, Calif.; Jack Berry, 935 North Kings Road; Hugo Butler, 2002 North Serrano Avenue; Leonardo Bercovici, 10520 Garwood Avenue; Edward Huebsch, 10200 La Nida, North Hollywood.

The La Nida address is incorrect, but I put the correct address in previously. This article continues:

Most of those sought are film writers. Boyle said his deputies have been searching for them for nearly a week but none could be located at the addresses given.

Mr. Tavenner, I have a letter here from the United States marshal regarding the individuals whom I have just testified about.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read it into the record.

Mr. WHEELER. The letter is dated April 6, 1951, and states:

Hon. JOHN S. WOOD,

*Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR Mr. WOOD: James J. Boyle, United States marshal for the southern District of California, wishes to state that he has been unable to comply with the committee's request that the following named persons be served subpoenas commanding their appearance in the District of Columbia: Georgia Backus Alexander, Jack Berry, Hugo Butler, Leonardo Bercovici, Edward Huebsch, Karen Morley, Fred Rinaldo, Lew Solomon, Michael Uris.

The marshal regrets to report this unusual situation exists despite the diligent search of his deputies for a period of several weeks in their attempt to effect the service.

Very truly yours,

JAMES J. BOYLE,  
*United States Marshal.*

Mr. DOYLE. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. WHEELER. April 6, 1951.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Would you say, Mr. Wheeler, that at all times while you were in California on both trips you made a diligent, in good faith, active effort to serve these people whom you have named with these subpoenas?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct, sir; and additional investigation was made concerning these individuals in an effort to locate them.

Mr. DOYLE. What effort did you make, other than what you have stated?

Mr. WHEELER. With your permission, sir, I would rather relate that in executive testimony.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I won't press it then. Do you feel from your investigation, what you know of the facts as you discovered them out there and saw them after conversing with these relatives and employees of these people that you have named, that they deliberately avoided service of the subpoenas?

Mr. WHEELER. That is my opinion, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Any further testimony?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Have you anything further for today?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. As far as public hearings are concerned, the committee will stand in recess until next Monday at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:25 p. m., the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a. m., Monday, April 23, 1951.)

# COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION- PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 2

---

MONDAY, APRIL 23, 1951

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

## PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to call at 10:25 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, James B. Frazier, Jr., Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; William A. Wheeler, Courtney E. Owens, and James Andrews, investigators; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. Wood. Let the committee be in order.

Let the record show that there are present the following members of the committee: Mr. Walter, Mr. Moulder, Mr. Frazier, Mr. Velde, Mr. Kearney, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Potter, and Mr. Wood, a quorum of the full committee.

I have a communication from Mr. Clyde Doyle, a member of the committee, stating that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, of which committee he is a member, has designated him to represent him as chairman and the committee membership to participate in the annual inspection and visit to West Point Military Academy, and that it will be impossible for him to be in attendance today, tomorrow, and the next day. I will file this letter for the record.

I would like at this point to read into the record a letter which I received from the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., dated April 20, 1951:

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As we advised you before you began your hearings on communism in Hollywood, your committee has the full cooperation and earnest backing of the Motion Picture Association of America.

Now, at a midpoint in your investigation, we note with satisfaction the cooperative spirit of a number of witnesses who have beamed the spotlight on Communists and their activities, while we deplore the unresponsive attitude of other witnesses.

The cooperative witnesses have heeded the injunction of the Hollywood Motion Picture Industry Council, composed of representatives from all segments of the industry—producers, labor unions, office workers, actors, writers, and directors.

On this point, as you recall, the MPIC filed a statement with your committee on March 27 which said:

"The MPIC hopes that all members of this industry who have been subpoenaed will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. It deplores those who stand on constitutional privileges to hide that truth, or those who refuse to recognize the authority of the Congress."

Your committee is performing valuable service to our national security in smoking out communism.

We wish to assure the committee of our continued support in this inquiry, and it is our hope it will accomplish the exposure of communism, not only in ours but in other vital and sensitive industries.

File that with the committee.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Comsels?

Mr. TAVENNER. Just one moment, please.

Mr. John Garfield, please.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Garfield, will you please raise your right hand and be sworn? You solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GARFIELD. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF JOHN JULES GARFIELD, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, LOUIS NIZER AND SIDNEY DAVIS

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your full name, please?

Mr. GARFIELD. John Jules Garfield.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented here by counsel?

Mr. GARFIELD. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify themselves for the record?

Mr. NIZER. My name is Louis Nizer, L-o-u-i-s N-i-z-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have associate counsel with you?

Mr. NIZER. Mr. Sidney Davis is with me; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where is your official residence?

Mr. NIZER. New York City, 180 West Fifty-eighth Street.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Garfield, when and where were you born?

Mr. GARFIELD. I was born in New York City, on the East Side, March 4, 1913.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present address?

Mr. GARFIELD. I pay taxes in California. I guess I would say 1052 North Carroll Drive, Los Angeles, is my business and present address, although my children go to school in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where are you now living, in New York or California?

Mr. GARFIELD. I live both in California and New York, mostly in California. I pay taxes in California. I consider myself legally a resident of California.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. GARFIELD. Actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give to the committee a brief statement of your educational training for your profession?

Mr. GARFIELD. I went to public school in New York City. I never finished high school. I then went to dramatic school, and from that first dramatic school I went to the Eva Le Gallienne Repertory School, where I was an apprentice or, as we call it in the theater, a "spear



carrier." Then I gradually worked my way in the theater and started as an actor in the theater.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you trace for us your career or profession since you entered the theater?

MR. GARFIELD. I started out studying for the legitimate theater, which I was always interested in, because a man in the public-school system by the name of Angelo Patri was the principal who influenced me in going into that work, and the first inclination was when I won an oratorical contest sponsored by the New York Times in 1927 on a subject called Franklin the Peace Maker of the Constitution. I think I started my acting career that way.

From then on I became more and more interested in school dramatics, and I gave up any other interest, and then went to dramatic school, won a scholarship, and from there played with the Hecksher Foundation, which was another dramatic school, and finally applied for a scholarship of Miss Le Gallienne's which was a school for young people, which I got, and from there I hitchhiked across the country to see America, and came back and played bits.

For instance, I think I was a bit player with Fritz Lieber's Shakespearean players at a buck a throw. From there I played Little Old Boy about a reform school; had a small part in Peace on Earth; had a part in Counselor at Law by Elmer Rice; I had a pretty good part in that. Then I got in the Group Theater.

MR. TAVENNER. When was that?

MR. GARFIELD. That was about in 1934, or possibly 1933. I know that the group had just done Sidney Kingsley's play Man and Wife. I got in the group right after that. Then I stayed with the group until it broke up and they all went to Hollywood.

I stayed on Broadway and played in a play called Having a Wonderful Time. Then the group returned and I was in Golden Boy. Then I left the group on my own and went to Hollywood in 1938.

MR. TAVENNER. Trace briefly your experience in Hollywood in your profession.

MR. GARFIELD. I came to Hollywood in 1938. I think I made approximately 31 pictures. The first picture was called Four Daughters. It was produced by Warner Bros. I was under contract to Warner Bros. 7½ years, and we made many outstanding, fine pictures at Warner Bros. One or two or three came to my mind, such as Destination Tokyo; Air Force, the story of the Air Corps during the bombing of Pearl Harbor; and one I am particularly proud of, Pride of the Marines, the story of Al Schmidt in Guadalcanal.

MR. TAVENNER. Your experience with Warner Bros. for 7½ years brings us up to the middle of 1945, I assume?

MR. GARFIELD. 1945 or 1946. Then I went into business for myself. I produced, or helped produce, Body and Soul, then played in Gentlemen's Agreement, which I had nothing to do with except work for Twentieth Century-Fox. I worked for Columbia in We Were Strangers, and played in Force of Evil, an exposé of the number racket. The last picture I did was He Ran All the Way, which I did myself.



Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Garfield, after you were served with a subpoena to appear before this committee as a witness, the New York Times carried a statement attributed to you which is as follows:

I have always hated communism. It is a tyranny which threatens our country and the peace of the world. Of course, then, I have never been a member of the Communist Party or a sympathizer with any of its doctrines. I will be pleased to cooperate with the committee.

Were you correctly quoted in the news article which I have just read?

Mr. GARFIELD. Absolutely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it a fact that you have always hated communism, as stated in that news release?

Mr. GARFIELD. Absolutely, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you of the opinion and belief that communism is a tyranny which threatens our country and the peace of the world?

Mr. GARFIELD. I believe so. I think it is a subversive movement and is a tyranny and is a dictatorship and is against democracy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GARFIELD. I have never been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you are willing to cooperate with the committee, as stated in this news release, in its endeavor to ascertain the extent of Communist infiltration into the entertainment field, particularly into the motion-picture industry, it will be necessary to ask you questions relating to your knowledge of Communist activities in that field, and especially about your own conduct in connection with organizations to which you have belonged and as to experiences which you have had. I understand you are willing to cooperate with the committee?

Mr. GARFIELD. Mr. Tavenner, I will answer any question you put to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you have stated to us that you went to Hollywood, I believe——

Mr. GARFIELD. In 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1938?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you a few questions about the period prior to that time.

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me the December 10, 1936, edition or issue of the Daily Worker, which has a column in it entitled "A YCL Drama Against War," and a subheading entitled "League Plans Gigantic Pageant for Lenin Memorial." In the course of that article appears the statement that "Jules Garfield of the Group Theatre is lending a hand in the promotion of this program." The program, of course, was a Young Communist League program.

Will you hand the article to Mr. Garfield?

(Said article was handed to Mr. Garfield.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine it and state whether or not you did participate in any way, lending your influence or your help to the organization of that program by the Young Communist League of New York?

Mr. GARFIELD. I have no knowledge of lending my name to this organization, particularly an organization called the Young Communist

League, because, believe me, if I had heard of such a name I would have run like hell. I have absolutely no knowledge of this; none whatsoever.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you at any time affiliated in any way with the Young Communist League?

MR. GARFIELD. No, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Reference is made in the article to your being a member of the Group Theater.

MR. GARFIELD. That is correct, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the Group Theater?

MR. GARFIELD. Well, the Group Theater was an offspring of the Theater Guild. The Theater Guild was comprised of the lead theatrical producers on Broadway for many years and is now. Certain members of the guild at that time wanted to form a permanent acting company, so they broke away from the guild. I joined the Group Theater when it had been already organized, and at the time I joined it, the Group Theater was run in this manner: There were three artistic directors, Miss Cheryl Crawford, now a producer on Broadway; Mr. Harold Clurman; and Mr. Lee Strassbourg. It was devoted mostly to doing plays which had to do with American life. It did plays by Sidney Kingsley, William Saroyan, and Clifford Odets. It was never at any time, to my knowledge, a political organization. It was an organization for actors to improve their craft, studying diction and so forth, and had the distinct honor of discovering Tennessee Williams.

MR. TAVENNER. How long were you a member of the Group Theater?

MR. GARFIELD. Four or five years.

MR. TAVENNER. That would bring us up to what date, your membership?

MR. GARFIELD. Up until the time I went to Hollywood.

MR. TAVENNER. It was cited as a Communist organization by the Tenney committee in 1948.

MR. GARFIELD. I was not a member of the Group Theater in 1948.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you know anything of its operations in 1948?

MR. GARFIELD. It was a defunct organization. I believe it became a defunct organization in 1940; 1940 or 1941, if I am not mistaken.

MR. TAVENNER. While you were a member of the Group Theater, did anything occur to lead you to believe that there was Communist activity within the Group in the form of an effort to influence its action or the way in which it operated?

MR. GARFIELD. You mean in the actual functioning of the organization or the plays that were done?

MR. TAVENNER. In the functioning of the organization or the adoption of the policies which it followed.

MR. GARFIELD. I don't think so. As I said, it was purely run on an artistic basis. In other words, it was run by these three people, and it was purely run on an artistic basis. It was not a political organization. Of course the actors on Broadway used to call us peculiar because we didn't accept employment on the outside, and took much less money than we usually would get, because we wanted to work together. And we worked in a certain way. We had a technical craft and worked in a certain way, and they thought that was kind of strange.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold camps out in the State of New York, one in a place named Ellenville?

Mr. GARFIELD. Oh, yes. We didn't have camps. I can explain that. We went out every summer, with our children, families, to rehearse the next season's play. We went to Ellenville and took an old hotel, and all the people lived in the hotel through the summer, to rehearse the play.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall any occasions when, at those camps, people were brought in who attacked the principles of our form of government?

Mr. GARFIELD. I do not, sir. I do recall, however, that one of the directors, or two, I am not just clear, had just come from Moscow where they had seen the Moscow Art Theater, and they talked about that. That is my best recollection of that. It is pretty long ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you went to Hollywood in 1938?

Mr. GARFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances which led to your going to Hollywood?

Mr. GARFIELD. Well, I had turned down Hollywood for 5 years. I was not interested. I was promised the lead in a play. It is a very personal story but I don't mind telling you.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not interested, for purposes here, in going into a personal story. Let us confine it to this: Who induced you to embark upon the Hollywood enterprise?

Mr. GARFIELD. They had been wanting me to come for 5 years and I turned it down because I wanted to be free to play in the theater. I started in the theater and wanted to continue my work in the theater. I had a falling out with some of the directors in the Group on the basis of a part I was supposed to get and didn't get, so I was a little angry and signed a contract. Warner Bros. signed me at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Harold Clurman, C-l-u-r-m-a-n?

Mr. GARFIELD. He was one of the directors of the Group Theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. What part did he play in your going to Hollywood?

Mr. GARFIELD. He was against my going to Hollywood. He wanted me to stay in the Group Theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you went to Hollywood you became employed immediately with Warner Bros., did you?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have an agent to represent you?

Mr. GARFIELD. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. In making that employment?

Mr. GARFIELD. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was your business agent?

Mr. GARFIELD. It was a company, A. and S. Lyons. The man who actually was influential is now deceased. His name was Sam Lyons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did any other person represent you as a business agent?

Mr. GARFIELD. Not at that time, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Catherine Roberts at any time represent you as a business agent?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, not at that time. She does now.

Mr. TAVENNER. She does now?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that relationship begin?

Mr. GARFIELD. Possibly around 1941; 1941 or 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. After arriving in Hollywood and becoming established in business there in the practice of your profession, did you have occasion to meet a person by the name of Elizabeth Leech?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, I never have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Possibly you may have known her by another name, Elizabeth Leech Glenn, G-l-e-n-n.

Mr. GARFIELD. That is a name that is not familiar to me.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Garfield, will you speak a little louder, please, sir.

Mr. GARFIELD. Oh, I beg your pardon. No, I don't know that individual at all.

Mr. MOULDER. Do we have any evidence that she was known by any other name, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. That was her married name.

Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Margaret Potts?

Mr. GARFIELD. No; I don't know anybody by that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with a person by the name of Barbara Myers?

Mr. GARFIELD. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with a person by the name of Eleanor Abowitz, A-b-o-w-i-t-z?

Mr. GARFIELD. That is a familiar name, but I didn't become acquainted with her. It is a familiar name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall this incident, or an incident, when she made arrangements for you to make a speech in behalf of Charlotte Bass, who was a candidate for city council of Los Angeles?

Mr. GARFIELD. I beg your pardon. I never spoke for Charlotte Bass for city council. I spoke for Helen Gahagan Douglas, but never for Charlotte Bass.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether Eleanor Abowitz spoke to you about it and endeavored to get your assistance?

Mr. GARFIELD. It is possible. I don't want to say "Yes" or "No." But I know that is a familiar name.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you have no recollection of her having made arrangements with you for such a speech?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. While in Hollywood did you become acquainted with a person by the name of Sidney Benson?

Mr. GARFIELD. I know that name, too. It is a familiar name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell us anything about the business in which Sidney Benson was engaged?

Mr. GARFIELD. I have no recollection. Was he a writer?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think he also went by the name of Sidney Bernstein, B-e-r-n-s-t-e-i-n. Does that strike a bell with you?

Mr. GARFIELD. No. I know a Benson who is a writer, a radio writer. But the Abowitz name strikes a bell with me.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you know about the activities of Eleanor Abowitz?

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't know anything about her activities. The name itself rings. I remember hearing that name before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you associated at any time in a business way with Hugo Butler?



Mr. GARFIELD. He was a writer. Not in a business way, but I know him as a screen writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you associated with him at any time in the production of a picture?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, yes, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What picture was that?

Mr. GARFIELD. A picture called *He Ran All the Way*, just recently, 6 or 8 months ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he interested with you in an enterprise known as Xandu Films, X-a-n-d-u?

Mr. GARFIELD. I think he was in that. I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us about that?

Mr. GARFIELD. That was a kind of organization, or a group of people, who thought they would get together and go into business for themselves. It failed. That is the best that I remember of it. I think that he was in that. I am not sure, but I think so. But I know him more from having written this script that I just finished, "*He Ran All the Way*."

Mr. TAVENNER. When did he write that script?

Mr. GARFIELD. This past summer, because we shot the picture in October.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge or information to cause you to believe that he was at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GARFIELD. None, whatsoever, sir. As a matter of fact, the only relationship I had with him was purely on a craft basis, the picture and the writing of the script. That is the only acquaintance I ever had with him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Hyman Kraft?

Mr. GARFIELD. Hy Kraft?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sometimes referred to as "Hy" Kraft.

Mr. GARFIELD. I knew him, yes, but it was very casual.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you associated with him closely enough that you had any means of knowing or judging as to what his Communist affiliations might be?

Mr. GARFIELD. I knew him only casually. I know Butler much better than I know Kraft.

Mr. WOOD. Spell that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. H-y-m-a-n K-r-a-f-t.

Mr. GARFIELD. He is known as "Hy" Kraft. He used to be a radio writer. I haven't seen him in years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Herbert Biberman, B-i-b-e-r-m-a-n?

Mr. GARFIELD. I know him casually. I wasn't acquainted with him. I didn't socialize with him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he at one time endeavor to get you to endorse an advertisement to *Open the New Front Now*, that program?

Mr. GARFIELD. Can you tell me what year that was?

Mr. TAVENNER. I should have said *Second Front* instead of *New Front*. It was in the period along the latter part of 1942 or early 1943.

Mr. GARFIELD. In other words, you mean about the Russians? In other words, the period we were allies with the Russians?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.



Mr. GARFIELD. I don't specifically remember it, but I certainly felt, as everyone else felt, that the Russians were our allies, and therefore we tried to help as much as possible.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not asking about your views. I am asking what Biberman did, if you recall?

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't know. I couldn't answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time make any contributions to a publication known as the New Masses, and I call your attention particularly to the year 1945 when a person by the name of Doretta Tarnon, T-a-r-m-o-n, was active in securing donations?

Mr. GARFIELD. And she claimed she got money from me?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking if you did make contributions to it?

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't know this person.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not?

Mr. GARFIELD. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you make contributions to the New Masses through any other person?

Mr. GARFIELD. I might have possibly subscribed to it from a dramatic, literary point of view, but I never made any contributions.

Mr. TAVENNER. The New Masses is known as a Communist publication. There were other publications.

Mr. GARFIELD. For instance, I subscribe to the Christian Science Monitor and Times Magazine.

Mr. TAVENNER. But what I am asking is whether you took part in any benefit or made any contribution—I am not talking about subscribing to the publication, but made a contribution to the People's World, the Daily Worker, and those papers?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Hanns Eisler?

Mr. GARFIELD. I knew him; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the occasion of your knowing him?

Mr. GARFIELD. He worked in Hollywood for quite a few years as a musician. I met him at cocktail parties, as I met many other people. That was my acquaintance with him. He was a musician in Hollywood. As a matter of fact, he never scored any picture I was in.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your acquaintanceship with him such that you were from time to time a guest in his home?

Mr. GARFIELD. Not from time to time. I might have gone to a cocktail party where I met him, or somebody else's house where I met him. He was not an intimate of mine.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any occasion to believe he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GARFIELD. None whatsoever.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Saul Kaplan, K-a-p-l-a-n?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes. He is a musician. I knew him well, in the sense that I visited in his home. He is a young musician who is now working in Hollywood as a composer. I knew him quite well.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any information or reason to believe, as a result of your close acquaintanceship with him, that Saul Kaplan was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir. As a matter of fact, these people—we never discussed politics in that sense; and, second, they never did trust me. I was a liberal, and I don't think the Communists like liberals, and I was quite outspoken about my liberalism.

Mr. TAVENNER. Lester Cole. You are acquainted with Lester Cole, are you not?

Mr. GARFIELD. Not acquainted. I know him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you closely enough acquainted with him to have knowledge of his Communist Party membership, activities, or ideas?

Mr. GARFIELD. No. I didn't know him that well.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. General Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to have stated for the record as to whether the names counsel is mentioning are or not, according to the files of the committee, members of the Communist Party, or just individuals in Hollywood. I say this for the reason that, if they are not, it seems to me to be rather unfair to these individuals to place their names in the record without making some statement as to whether or not they are Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. The person that I have just inquired about was stated to be a member of the Communist Party by a witness, I think, in the course of these hearings, and there is information in the committee's files indicating Communist Party membership of all—

Mr. KEARNEY. Of all the individuals you have mentioned?

Mr. TAVENNER. Of all I have specifically inquired about as to his association with them. There were one or two individuals mentioned in the beginning, in connection with his business enterprises, that that would not apply to, or at least that I am not informed about. One, for instance, is the person who acted as his agent; I think two persons who acted as his agent. I do not recall any information relating to those two.

Mr. MOULDER. In other words, there is no evidence whatsoever that they were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. TAVENNER. Not to my personal knowledge.

Mr. KEARNEY. The name Biberman—he was one of the 10 convicted Hollywood writers, was he not?

Mr. TAVENNER. As to Biberman, there is evidence relating to him. As to Elizabeth Leech, she has been mentioned several times during the course of the hearings as a party functionary. Hugo Butler is under subpoena to appear here. There is information relating to "Hy" Kraft as being a member of the Communist Party; and the rest of those whose names I mentioned.

And I would like to ask you if you were acquainted with Frank Tuttle?

Mr. WOOD. Spell it.

Mr. TAVENNER. T-u-t-t-l-e.

Mr. GARFIELD. I hardly knew him. I knew who he was. He was a director, but I never worked with him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with George Willner, W-i-l-l-n-e-r?

Mr. GARFIELD. I knew him: yes. We were members of the same tennis club in Beverly Hills called the Beverly Hills Tennis Club.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you closely enough associated with him to have any knowledge concerning his Communist Party activity or relationship or affiliation?

Mr. GARFIELD. No. I had no knowledge of it—none whatsoever. We never discussed that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time become personally acquainted with V. J. Jerome?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Alexander Trachtenberg?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Spell it.

Mr. TAVENNER. T-r-a-c-h-t-e-n-b-e-r-g.

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been evidence here that the former, Jerome, was a member of the national committee, and Alexander Trachtenberg was also a member of the national committee, of the Communist Party.

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have never met those people?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were in Hollywood, were you associated in any way with Actors' Laboratory, Inc.?

Mr. GARFIELD. I would like to tell you about that. I was never associated with Actors' Lab; I was never an officers of Actors' Lab. I one time did a play for the veterans' program, not at the Actors' Lab, but at a theater called Las Palmas Theatre, which is downtown. They had a veterans' program, to give scholarships to veterans under the GI Bill of Rights. I checked it before I gave my services, and I found it to be the fact. In other words, they are an authentic school. At that time—I believe it was 1946—the major studios sent many of their players to this place. I appeared in a play for them for the purpose of raising money for veterans who had missed 3 or 4 years of their careers, so that they would have an opportunity to be seen again. That is the only relationship I have had with this organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your personal secretary at that time a person by the name of Helen Schlain?

Mr. GARFIELD. Sloate, not Schlain; S-l-o-a-t-e. I had a girl who worked for me at that time by that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did she also go by the name of Helen Schlain?

Mr. GARFIELD. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did she hold an official position in the Actors' Laboratory as a secretary or something of that nature?

Mr. GARFIELD. She hung around there. I don't know what her position was. I had no knowledge of her outside activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at any time authorize her to represent you in connection with any of the business coming before the meetings of that organization?

Mr. GARFIELD. Absolutely never, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or did you authorize her to act for you in any other organization?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir; no, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. As an actor it was necessary for you to become a member of the Actors' Guild, was it not?

Mr. GARFIELD. The Screen Actors' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Screen Actors' Guild?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1945, during the period of the strike in the moving-picture industry, the Communist Party is alleged to have

been interested in influencing various groups in connection with that strike. Do you have any knowledge on your own part regarding that effort?

MR. GARFIELD. Well, I have no knowledge of what the Communist Party was doing, because I had no association with anybody like that, but I was on the executive board of the Screen Actors' Guild for 6 years, and during the period of this strike, and I know pretty well what went on in terms of the strike, in terms of the guild's position, and in terms of the general atmosphere at that time.

MR. TAVENNER. What effort was made by the Communist Party to influence the action of the guild with regard to that strike?

MR. GARFIELD. Well, the strike started in 1945. We of the Screen Actors' Guild tried in every way possible to stop it. We played a very impartial role at the beginning. As a matter of fact, some of us were accused of being sympathetic to the CSU, which was the other side, at the beginning. We then proceeded to get all the information we could, and we did. This took us until about 1946, and we discovered that the culprits in the thing were the CSU. They didn't want to settle the strike.

MR. TAVENNER. The culprits were who?

MR. GARFIELD. The CSU, Conference of Studio Unions.

MR. TAVENNER. I have here the minutes of the board of directors of the Screen Actors' Guild from 1945—March 15, 1945, to be specific—to 1947, when the most important decisions were made, with motions and secondings, motions which I personally made, which clearly bear out the statement that I make that I was against the strike and felt that this was a strike which was uncalled for and unwarranted.

I would like to give this to the committee, if I may, as part of the records, because these minutes show quite conclusively my position, anyway, personally, on how I voted.

MR. WOOD. You may leave a copy with the reporter for such use as the committee may see fit to make of it.

MR. JACKSON. That is for the use of the committee and not for the record?

MR. WOOD. That is right.

MR. GARFIELD. By the way, I would like to make a point here, Mr. Tavenner, if I may. I was making a picture then, and it was against my interests that the strike continue. I was in the process of making a film then, and it was against my interests that the strike continue, and, as a matter of fact, I went through the picket line with many other people to go to our jobs.

This is a summary of a meeting of the board of directors of the Screen Actors' Guild on September 17, 1946. A motion was made by Franchot Tone that members of the guild be instructed to go through picket lines and live up to their contract. This motion was carried, and Garfield voted for it.

A motion was made by Franchot Tone, seconded by Leon Ames, that the guild make every effort to see that the studios provide adequate physical protection for its members when crossing picket lines. I voted for the motion, and it was carried.

MR. TAVENNER. Prior to the adoption of that motion, had you followed a different approach to that subject? What had been your attitude about the picket line prior to that time?



Mr. GARFIELD. Well, in the beginning of that period I was personally inclined to be sympathetic, in the beginning; but, when I discovered the real facts in the case, the minutes bear out how I voted.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you assist in the picketing at any time?

Mr. GARFIELD. No. In 1947 during the hearings somebody got up and said I was in one of the picket lines, and I sent a telegram at that time to the committee—I am sure that it is on record—that this was not correct and was untrue.

As a matter of fact, the minutes show that Garfield seconded a motion made by Morgan Wallace:

*Resolved*, That the mail ballot to be sent to the membership should include a statement from the board recommending that members vote against observance of the picket line in the current studio strike.

This motion was carried unanimously March 15, 1945. This was the first meeting at which this was discussed.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period in which the Communist Party was interesting itself in that particular strike movement, was there any time when your views coincided with the Communist Party views and aims in connection with that strike, or were they at all times divergent?

Mr. GARFIELD. I would say at most times they were divergent, but I didn't know their point of view. Once I remember a meeting of about 150 actors at a private home which I heard about and went to. As a matter of fact, Ronald Reagan was there, and when he saw me he was surprised, and when I saw him I was surprised, and we reported this at a meeting, that there were special meetings being held. The membership of the Screen Actors' Guild voted 98.9 percent against supporting this strike, eventually.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you still a member of the guild?

Mr. GARFIELD. I am not a member of the executive board, but I am a member of the Screen Actors' Guild; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period of this controversy, were you able to identify any persons who, from their statements to you or from other evidence that would satisfy you, were members of the Communist Party, in connection with the activities on this problem?

Mr. GARFIELD. Well, they were against the majority opinion. That is the best I can say. They were in favor, for instance, of the position of the CSU, which we weren't.

Mr. VELDE. I don't think you have answered the question that counsel asked you. He asked if you knew of any Communist Party members.

Mr. GARFIELD. Officially, do you mean?

Mr. TAVENNER. Either from statements they made to you or from what you learned about them?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. You said you were sympathetic with the strike until you learned the real facts. What were the real facts that caused you to change your opinion?

Mr. GARFIELD. At the beginning, for instance, there was a milk fund being raised for the children of the strikers. It is possible I might have helped in that effort. But when it became violent, and

when the guild as a guild went into the facts of the case to determine where the violence emanated from—it was a jurisdictional dispute—when we got the interested parties together we sat in meetings with them and argued with them, as the minutes of our executive sessions will show, for 1 whole year. We tried to get them to see that the best thing to do was to settle the strike. At the end we discovered that the recalcitrants, the CSU, were not interested in settling the strike, and we issued a statement condemning certain people.

Mr. WALTER. In other words, you found they were interested only in striking and causing disorder?

Mr. GARFIELD. They had another purpose.

Mr. WALTER. What was the other purpose?

Mr. GARFIELD. They kept changing their purpose. They started by saying it was a jurisdictional dispute. Then they changed to a fight for wages and hours.

Mr. WALTER. In other words, you concluded the whole thing was a Communist movement and not a legitimate labor dispute?

Mr. GARFIELD. Well, it was not a legitimate labor dispute.

Mr. WALTER. It was then that you lost sympathy with the strike?

Mr. GARFIELD. That is right.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do your records show it was a Communist-inspired strike?

Mr. GARFIELD. The minutes of the Screen Actors' Guild, you mean? No, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did the Screen Actors' Guild determine it was a Communist-inspired strike?

Mr. GARFIELD. They didn't state it that way.

Mr. KEARNEY. But they had that in their minds?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Did you have that in your mind, Mr. Garfield?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. VELDE. What caused you to believe it was a Communist-inspired strike?

Mr. GARFIELD. I felt it was not a legitimate strike on the part of a labor union fighting for real demands, and that certain groups were using this strike as a wedge.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you know Herbert K. Sorrell?

Mr. GARFIELD. We met him. I didn't know him personally.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you know he was a Communist?

Mr. GARFIELD. I didn't know that, but I knew he was the fellow on the other end of the line, so to speak, and the executive board of the Screen Actors' Guild met with him to try to settle the strike.

Mr. KEARNEY. He was against settling it?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. As a matter of fact, it was he and his crowd who prolonged the strike?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have referred to your vote on that matter. Was Anne Revere one of those who voted on that same resolution?

Mr. GARFIELD. I am sure she did. She was a member of the Board of the Screen Actors' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which way did she vote?

Mr. GARFIELD. Well, it is pretty difficult to remember. I know how I voted.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did she vote the same way with you or contrary to that?

Mr. GARFIELD. Well, it is very difficult to say. I know how I voted because I have two letters here by members of the board at the time that I was a member of it, in which they remember my way of voting.

Mr. KEARNEY. Don't the minutes show the way they voted?

Mr. GARFIELD. Some do and some don't. On this vote they don't indicate the names.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did they indicate yours?

Mr. GARFIELD. There was no indication of any names.

Mr. KEARNEY. The letters do, though?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIZER. May we offer those?

Mr. TAVENNER. The minutes merely refer to the vote for and against?

Mr. GARFIELD. The final vote. If you go through the minutes, you will see very easily how certain people voted.

Mr. WOOD. The letters that the witness has tendered will be received by the reporter for such consideration as the committee may see fit to give them.

Mr. POTTER. Are the minutes you have submitted to the committee full minutes or excerpts from the minutes?

Mr. GARFIELD. They are full minutes, detailed. They have the voting record on most of the resolutions.

Mr. POTTER. And that will be found in the minutes which you have submitted?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Garfield, the committee is in possession of considerable information relating to various Communist-front organizations with which you are alleged to have affiliated in one way or another, or sponsored, and I would like to ask you some questions about those.

Mr. GARFIELD. Surely.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee is one. It appears that you sponsored a dinner held at the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles on February 4, 1945, under the auspices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, which dinner was held for the purpose of raising funds.

Mr. GARFIELD. I have no knowledge of being a member of that organization, and I don't have any recollection of sponsoring that dinner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will check further to make certain of the exact date and circumstances, and we will return to the question. Let me ask if you recall at such a meeting that you introduced Paul Robeson?

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't have any recollection. I possibly could have gone to it, but I never was a member of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You would recall if you introduced Paul Robeson, wouldn't you?

Mr. GARFIELD. I certainly would.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall?

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't recall it. If it was during the war, then it is possible that that might have happened.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall in 1946 that a Mr. John Webber interviewed you with reference to sponsoring a dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on behalf of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Mr. GARFIELD. Interviewed me? Did I sponsor the dinner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he confer with you about it?

Mr. GARFIELD. I knew him, but I don't recall his interviewing me about sponsoring the dinner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall if you did sponsor such a dinner?

Mr. GARFIELD. To the best of my knowledge I have no recollection of that, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall on July 20, 1942, that the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee sponsored what was called a free people's dinner at the Beverly Hills Hotel to raise funds for the transportation of anti-Axis leaders out of France?

Mr. GARFIELD. If it was during the war, it is possible I might have been at this meeting, but I don't specifically remember that function.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't remember whether you were a sponsor of it or not?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir. You know, I would like to point out, Mr. Tavenner, what a difficult and tough situation a guy like me is in, because I get a million requests all the time from various organizations, some very worthy ones, and I would like to point out to the committee an example of what happened to me, because I am in this situation where I am in the public eye and people think "He is a nice guy; maybe he will do it for us; why not do it," and so forth.

I have a letter from the National Citizens' Political Action Committee dated August 7, 1945, in which it is stated.

The executive board invites you to serve on this general council because of your continued interest in our organization. Meetings will not be called frequently so that the time demand will not be great.

I would like to point out particularly this last paragraph:

We sincerely hope that you will join us in the work of our important organization. We would appreciate knowing your wishes in this matter. If we receive no reply from you by Friday, August 17, we will consider your position as accepting membership on our general council.

I answered "No," but it is just possible that a thing like this would come to me and I would throw it away in a wastebasket, and 3 months from now I would be on this committee.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, may I just suggest—

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. That isn't every other person in the motion-picture industry in precisely the same position?

Mr. GARFIELD. Pretty much so; yes.

Mr. JACKSON. And isn't it true there are literally hundreds of people in the industry whose actions have never made them suspect?

Mr. GARFIELD. Possibly, but I have always been an outstanding liberal.

Mr. VELDE. You say you are an outstanding liberal?

Mr. GARFIELD. That is what they said.

Mr. VELDE. You mentioned a while ago that the Communist Party didn't trust you.



Mr. GARFIELD. They don't trust liberals.

Mr. POTTER. Many times they use liberals.

Mr. GARFIELD. They try; yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. I would say Alger Hiss was known as a very outstanding liberal. Certainly he gained some element of approval and acceptance by the Communist Party.

Mr. KEARNEY. And also by the Government of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of a motion-picture committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship?

Mr. GARFIELD. Could you tell me what year that was?

Mr. TAVENNER. 1943.

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't remember being a member. I don't remember an organization of that kind.

Mr. TAVENNER. This may refresh your recollection about it. Pauline Swanson, National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, issued a press release indicating that on August 22, 1943, a speech and cocktail party would be given at the Mocambo Restaurant in Hollywood in honor of Russian film director Mikhail Kalatozov, which was being arranged by the motion-picture committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Among the list of sponsors was the name of John Garfield.

Mr. GARFIELD. Well, I don't remember sponsoring that organization. I spoke at one time, in 1943—I remember this vividly, it was during the war when the Russians were our allies—downtown at the Shrine Auditorium with Mayor Bowron and many city officials and many people in the motion-picture industry. That is the only function I remember in relation to that organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to ask you about the Congress on Civil Rights held in Detroit, Mich., during April 1946.

Mr. GARFIELD. That I absolutely and flatly deny. I had absolutely nothing to do with it. Once or twice they had written me letters to become a member of that organization and I turned them down. I was never connected in any way with that organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did I ask you at an earlier time whether you were actually associated with the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, you did; and I said I wasn't, and I continue to say I wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you contributed money to that organization?

Mr. GARFIELD. They used to give concerts and benefits for the theater, and it is possible I might have bought some tickets for the theater or for the concerts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you associated in any way with the Council on African Affairs, Inc.?

Mr. GARFIELD. None whatsoever.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker of December 29, 1948, you were referred to as having been a signer of a statement asking for the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities which was issued by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. First I would like to ask you, were you a member of that organization?

Mr. GARFIELD. I was not a member of that organization. The only organization I was a member of that had to do with that was the Committee for the First Amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not speaking of your membership in that organization at this time, but how about the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

Mr. GARFIELD. I was not a member of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. I contributed some money to them when they were an arm of the Democratic Party, but I never had a membership in the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

I might point out, Mr. Tavenner, that I have always been a registered Democrat, and have contributed to the Democratic Party. Not only that, but I have contributed to the Liberal Party in New York headed by David Dubinsky, outstanding anti-Communist labor-union leader. Those are the only two parties I ever belonged to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Information available to the committee indicates that you were a member of the sponsors' committee of the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief in 1945. Is that correct?

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't think I was a member of the committee, but I contributed some money. I would like to tell you the story of that, if I may.

When I was overseas in 1944, I was with a USO show, and we were in Italy doing what was commonly called at that time the "bomber run." We would go from Naples to Cascina and play all the hospitals and to the front-line troops. Then we went over to Bari and covered Foggia, which was also a front-line center for troops.

At that time an officer in the Special Services of the United States Army came to me and said, "Look, we want you to do us a very special favor. Would you have your troupe entertain 10,000 Yugoslav Partisans being secretly trained?"

I said, "Are you kidding? In the first place, we can't speak their language."

He said, "It would be a good gesture. We can't tell you where we are taking you. It is secret."

I said, "I can't speak for the rest of the troupe, but I can speak for myself. I will do it."

I spoke to the rest of the troupe and they agreed and we went and entertained the Yugoslav Partisans. They gave a party afterward, and at that time I met a man called Colonel Dedijer.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the name?

Mr. GARFIELD. You got me there.

Mr. TAVENNER. D-e-d-i-j-e-r?

Mr. GARFIELD. I guess so. He came to the United States during the San Francisco Conference in 1945 and looked me up. He had lost his wife and child in the war, and he was raising money for Yugoslav relief. As a matter of fact, he was also very interested in getting some of the pictures that their country had not seen since the occupation of the Nazis. So I sent him to the Motion Picture Academy of Arts and Sciences, where he got a list of those films.

It was through him that I contributed the money to this Yugoslav organization, and I would like to show you the canceled checks, which I have. One is for \$50 and one is for \$5. And this is the list of sponsors of the organization called the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief: Marshall Field, Mrs. E. M. M. Warburg, James P. Warburg, John Dewey, Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Spyros P. Skouras. This is the only money I gave to Yugoslav relief.

(Letter and two canceled checks turned over to committee staff by the witness.)

Mr. TAVENNER. The New York Times of March 3, 1945, contained an advertisement paid for by the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade advocating a break with Franco Spain. Among those listed as sponsoring the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade is your name.

Mr. GARFIELD. Again let me say to the committee and to you that I was for Spain because I felt it was a democratically elected government. I was against the Communists in there as much as I was against the Fascists in there. That was my position and has always been my position. I was and still am against the Communists and against the Fascists. However, on this particular point that you mention, I have no knowledge of ever giving permission to them to use my name. The only organization that I worked with about Spain was an organization called the Theater Arts Committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of or associated with Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or with the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Did you know at the time that the Abraham Lincoln Brigade was a Communist-sponsored group?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir; I didn't know it. Had I known it—although I don't remember having sponsored this particular event—I would have had nothing to do with it. But I still feel the same way about Spain.

Mr. VELDE. You had no reason to believe that group was Communist-sponsored?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned earlier you were a member of the Committee for the First Amendment?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us what part you played in this group?

Mr. GARFIELD. I will be happy to.

Mr. MOULDER. What group is that?

Mr. GARFIELD. Committee for the First Amendment, which was organized in 1947 in California. I was in New York at that time. I was not in on the organization of this committee. I received a telephone call—I am not quite sure whether it was from John Huston—asking me to come down to Washington for two reasons. One was that the industry as an industry was being called unpatriotic and un-American, and we felt that we had done an outstanding job in the war, and we felt it was our duty as people who worked in the industry to come to its defense. That was point No. 1.

Point No. 2 was the issue of free speech. Mr. Eric Johnston said at that particular time, "I may be against everything you believe in, but I will fight for the right for you to say so."

Mr. JACKSON. I think the record should show Eric Johnston was anticipated a number of years in that remark.

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't know about that, but I remember that instance.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think it was Victor Hugo who first said that, or Voltaire.

Mr. GARFIELD. I also recall in a conversation I had with Mr. Huston I said, "The most important thing is that it must not be Communist-associated, because if we want to make a fight on the issue that is quite important." That is my recollection. As a matter of fact, I think the New York Times quoted me as saying that. There were no Communists in that organization to my knowledge.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question at this time?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. You stated you wanted to make sure there were no Communists identified with this movement, Committee for the First Amendment. You must have known of a certain movement, or of certain Communist activity, in Hollywood, or you would not have been suspicious of it?

Mr. GARFIELD. That was because of the hearing, you know.

Mr. POTTER. If you were so cautious as to make sure no Communist was identified with your group, certainly you knew of Communist activity in Hollywood or you would not have been so cautious?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, not necessarily; not necessarily.

Mr. POTTER. All right.

Mr. GARFIELD. We had, as a matter of fact, on that committee, very strong liberals and very strong conservatives.

Mr. POTTER. You don't believe there were any Communists identified with the group?

Mr. GARFIELD. I made the point very clear, "If we are going to fight on that issue, we must be sure there is nobody in the organization with a left tinge." If you will look at the list of people who came here in 1947, the list will speak for itself, I am sure.

Mr. POTTER. That was in protest to the hearings in 1947?

Mr. GARFIELD. Exactly.

Mr. POTTER. If I remember, at that time 10 Hollywood people were cited for contempt who refused to cooperate with the committee, and some of those, I am sure, were known Communists.

Mr. GARFIELD. But they were not on the Committee for the First Amendment. We were fighting on general principles. It had nothing to do with these people. That is the whole point. It had nothing to do with these individuals, believe me. It had to do with the two basic principles. It had nothing to do with the individuals.

Mr. WOOD. What you mean is that that was your conception of it?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes. As I have said, I wasn't in on the organization of it. I wasn't in California. Some 2 or 3 months later I did a play, Skipper Next to God, and the Daily Worker panned me and said I was a little punch-drunk for playing in a religious play like Skipper Next to God.

Mr. VELDE. How did you know about the Daily Worker saying that?

Mr. GARFIELD. I look in all papers and try to find out all information about myself.

Mr. VELDE. I was interested in how you happened to see it.

Mr. GARFIELD. Would you like to see the copy?

Mr. VELDE. No. I have seen many copies of the Daily Worker. I asked how you happened to look at the Daily Worker.

Mr. GARFIELD. They review all plays.



Mr. VELDE. There is nothing sinister in my question.

Mr. GARFIELD. Most actors, if they are actors at all, like to see all the reviews, regardless of what paper publishes them. That was a review of a play I was in.

Mr. VELDE. You still haven't answered my question, Mr. Garfield. How did you happen to get hold of a copy of the Daily Worker?

Mr. GARFIELD. It was a review in the Daily Worker.

Mr. VELDE. I realize that. Do you remember where you obtained the copy?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes. I got a copy by buying a copy. They have a dramatic critic and they review plays just like the New York Times or the Herald Tribune.

Mr. MOULDER. We subscribe to the Daily Worker here.

Mr. JACKSON. And the witness should know that this committee also shared the criticism of the Daily Worker.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. At least one purpose and object of the Committee for the First Amendment was to influence the hearings that this committee was then engaged in, was it not, that is, the Hollywood hearings in which this committee was then engaged?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir. We were defending the industry. We were following Mr. Johnston and Mr. Paul V. McNutt.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have stated that you were willing to cooperate with this committee here now?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you have cooperated with it then, in 1947?

Mr. GARFIELD. I would have, yes. I have nothing to hide, sir. I certainly would have.

Mr. TAVENNER. As you look back upon your activity in connection with the Committee for the First Amendment, do you now take the same view you took then, or do you feel that this committee should properly investigate communism in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. GARFIELD. Pretty much, except one thing. There is a big difference between fighting for a legitimate political party and fighting for a subversive group, which I consider the Communists to be, and that is where I would differ today.

Mr. TAVENNER. You now consider it to be a subversive group rather than a political party?

Mr. GARFIELD. Exactly. For instance, I am a Democrat, and if you were a Republican I would fight like the devil for your right to speak up. But I feel that these people are not a legitimate political party.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1947, Mr. Garfield, it was no secret that the Communist Party was a conspiratorial group that intended to overthrow this Government, even by use of force and violence if necessary.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson left hearing room.)

Mr. GARFIELD. It is much clearer now than it was then; much clearer.

Mr. POTTER. When did you determine in your own mind that the Communist Party was a conspiracy?

Mr. GARFIELD. When Wallace decided to run on a third party ticket, I quit. I felt he was being captured.

Mr. POTTER. Up until the formation of the so-called Wallace Party, Progressive Party, you didn't in your own mind believe the Communist Party was anything other than a political party?

Mr. GARFIELD. Exactly. That is what creates an awful lot of confusion in many people's minds. They say, "This party is on the ballot," and they think it is automatically a legitimate party. It seems to me if the Communist Party was outlawed it would help clear up a lot of confusion on that point.

Mr. POTTER. I share your view.

Mr. WOOD. You have indicated some knowledge of the Communist Party at that time and its activities. How could you possibly know anything about the activities of the Communist Party if you didn't know who its members were?

Mr. GARFIELD. I had no knowledge who its members were, and didn't know all its workings.

Mr. WOOD. How could you formulate an opinion?

Mr. GARFIELD. Mr. Potter asked me when I changed.

Mr. WOOD. You can't change your position on an organization that you don't know anything about, can you?

Mr. GARFIELD. I felt this way: I was for Wallace up until the time he ran on a ticket that I thought was being captured by a small group of people, in general. I didn't know the people specifically. I felt he was being captured.

Mr. WOOD. Did I understand you to say you thought Wallace was being captured by people who were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. How did you know that?

(Representative Donald L. Jackson returned to hearing room.)

Mr. GARFIELD. That was public knowledge. I had no other information except that.

Mr. WOOD. It is my understanding you didn't know any of the people who formed the group that took him over?

Mr. GARFIELD. Who captured him?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARFIELD. No.

Mr. WOOD. You still think it was a Communist group?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. And you still say you didn't know a single one of those?

Mr. GARFIELD. Except from the newspapers. But that is when I broke away.

Mr. WOOD. You broke away from what?

Mr. GARFIELD. From the Progressive Party.

Mr. WOOD. You had been affiliated with the Progressive Party?

Mr. GARFIELD. I was not a member of it. The only party I was ever a member of was the Democratic Party, but I contributed money to the Progressive Citizens of America because they were an arm of the Democratic Party on some issues. For instance, they backed Mrs. Douglas in California. I supported that.

Mr. WOOD. Let me ask you categorically, have you any knowledge of the identity of a single individual who was a member of the Communist Party during the time you were in Hollywood?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. As I understand, you formed your opinion not by any personal knowledge of or association with any member of the Communist Party, but like all of us, you formulated your opinion from general information that was disseminated?

Mr. GARFIELD. Exactly, Mr. Congressman.

(Representative Francis E. Walter left hearing room.)

Mr. WOOD. Anything further?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

In connection with your work on the Committee for the First Amendment, did you sponsor a call upon Congress to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't remember sponsoring that. I am very honest about that, very frank about that.

Mr. MOULDER. What was that question?

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked if he joined in a movement calling upon Congress to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir; not to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you contribute to its support?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

(Representative Francis E. Walter returned to hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you associated in any way with the China Aid Council?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir. I was in favor of the Chinese when they were attacked by the Japanese, like any decent human being would be.

Mr. MOULDER. That was during the war, was it?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. That is, during the last World War when we were at war with Japan?

Mr. GARFIELD. What is the date on that?

Mr. TAVENNER. May 5, 1940.

Mr. MOULDER. That was after the attack on Pearl Harbor?

Mr. GARFIELD. No; before, when the Japanese were attacking the Chinese before Pearl Harbor. They were practicing up for Pearl Harbor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever in China?

Mr. GARFIELD. No; I was never in China. The man who got me interested in this was a great hero for me and a personal friend, Gen. Evans Carlson, of the Marine Raiders.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe in some of the speeches which you made in connection with the China Aid Council you extolled the democratic processes in Communist China to a great extent?

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't remember. There was no Communist China at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. But in the sections in which the Communists had control?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir. I don't remember making any speech of that kind. There was no such thing as a Communist government in China at that time. There was a Nationalist government.

I would like to point out, Mr. Tavenner, that before Pearl Harbor I went overseas. It was during the time that the war was called an imperialistic war by the Communists. I went overseas on a special

mission. I have the honor of being the first American actor to go overseas during the war. We covered about 1,500 miles of bases in the Caribbean and North and South America. This was before Pearl Harbor. It was not a very popular trip in terms of Communists. They thought it was perpetrating a war.

Mr. TAVENNER. Going back to a much earlier date, I believe that you were one of a group of artists and educators who supported the Moscow trials?

Mr. GARFIELD. I looked into that, sir. I have no knowledge and I flatly say I have never given permission for my name to be used on that particular statement.

Mr. TAVENNER. You deny having consented to the making of such a statement?

Mr. GARFIELD. Absolutely. I was against those trials. They were undemocratic, dictatorial.

Mr. TAVENNER. Back in 1940—in fact, on April 1, 1940—while the nonaggression pact between Russia and Germany was in effect, I believe you were the honored guest at a meeting here in Washington at which you delivered an address attacking the intensive war drives then in progress and urging your listeners to read Dalton Trumbo's antiwar novel, *Johnny Got His Gun*.

Mr. GARFIELD. That is absolutely untrue. I was never in Washington in 1940 and I never made such a speech. As I explained to you, I went overseas at that time, when the Communists considered the war an imperialistic war. It doesn't make sense.

Mr. TAVENNER. You deny making such a speech?

Mr. GARFIELD. Definitely and absolutely. As a matter of fact, I have checks here for Bundles for Britain in 1940. I have checks for Catholic institutions. No Communist would contribute to Bundles for Britain or to Catholic institutions in that period.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am aware that later you made different statements.

Mr. GARFIELD. Even General MacArthur said the future of generations rested on the Red banner, or something of that kind. I was supporting our Allies—Dutch, Chinese, whoever was fighting dictatorships.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time a sponsor of the China Conference Committee in 1946?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was a group which sponsored the removal of American troops from China at that time. Did you ever sponsor a movement of that kind?

Mr. GARFIELD. Never; absolutely, positively no.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask you a few questions now regarding your attitude at the time of the attack by Russia on Finland. What was the first position that you took on that subject?

Mr. GARFIELD. I took no position on that subject, but it was an interesting thing. I didn't take any position one way or another, but I did, I remember, pose for pictures for Finnish aid, and I did state publicly that I was for Finnish war relief.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you associated with Mr. Louis Schaffer?

Mr. GARFIELD. Was I associated with him?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, in any way.

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.



Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know Mr. Schaffer?

Mr. GARFIELD. I just know him by a telephone conversation. I never met him personally.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall sending a wire to Mr. Schaffer regarding your position toward Russia and Finland?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, I do. I stated that I was for Finland in that wire.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, then, did you follow that up with a letter to Mr. Schaffer in which you took a different position?

Mr. GARFIELD. No. I said to him I didn't think it was fair for him to use the letter originally which he did against my wishes. I remember saying that to him. That was all.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you what purports to be a copy of your letter to Mr. Schaffer. Will you look at it and see whether you can identify it as a copy of the letter that you wrote him?

Mr. GARFIELD. 1950?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. The date has nothing to do with the letter. That is the date when we obtained the copy.

Mr. GARFIELD. It says March 18, 1950.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. TAVENNER. Which is the date upon which we obtained the copy, I believe. The date, March 18, 1950, has nothing to do with the letter.

Mr. GARFIELD. I recall no such letter, especially on this date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Other than the date, do you recall the contents of the letter?

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't, very frankly, no. I would like to show you what I have here. The date here is the New Leader, a well-known anti-Communist paper, March 16, 1940:

John Garfield, the well-known stage and screen actor, wired: "If such a statement was issued, it was without my knowledge or consent, because I feel Finland should be helped. Can you send me that statement?"

It is stated here:

In the following article Louis Schaffer exposes TAC for the papier mâché front it is. The documents he discusses are on file in the New Leader office. John Garfield, shown here, was one of those whose names were used without authorization to cover TAC maneuvers. It's all in the article.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you later repudiate your statement in the telegram?

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't remember repudiating it, I honestly don't. And I never wrote that letter.

Mr. NIZER. We would be glad to have that marked for the record [referring to photostat of page from New Leader, March 16, 1940].

Mr. TAVENNER. We will file it as a part of the testimony for the consideration of the committee, unless the chairman rules otherwise.

Mr. NIZER. Does that make it part of the record?

Mr. TAVENNER. It will not be printed.

Mr. NIZER. I understood all the documents were to be part of the record. I think we did offer what documents we had so as to be helpful, not for the purpose of circumscribing his testimony.

Mr. KEARNEY. As I recall, in all our hearings before, documents handed to the stenographer were made a part of the record.

<sup>1</sup>The date on typed copy of this letter incorrectly appears as March 18, 1950. Verification of the correct date, March 18, 1940, is in the files of the committee.

Mr. WOOD. Not unless so designated. We have previously received documentary matter for the consideration of the committee only. It doesn't necessarily follow, when a document is received by the committee, that it is embodied in the record.

Mr. MOULDER. Is the quotation by Mr. Tavenner a part of the record? Will it be a part of the record, the letter, I mean?

Mr. WOOD. No.

Mr. NIZER. If it is before the committee, in whatever way, it is all right. We don't care about the technical aspects.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no objection to making it a part of the record and printing it all, but we frequently do not print it all.

Mr. DAVIS. These documents are so few.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Garfield, there has been information regarding a trip you made to a Russian ship on the west coast. Is there any significance to that?

Mr. GARFIELD. I would like to tell the committee the facts on that. In 1945 or 1946 the State Department invited Constantine Semenov to come to the United States at their expense. Mr. Semenov was shown around the various studios and was entertained at Robert Montgomery's house and at the homes of many other people. We made the gesture of friendly relationship with him, cultural exchange.

I met Mr. Semenov the first time in Hollywood, and he invited us to come and have a drink with him on a Russian ship in San Pedro. We went and had a drink. The press was there. We invited the press in. A State Department official was there who was the interpreter. That is the first and last time I saw Mr. Semenov.

Mr. MOULDER. What was the date of that?

Mr. GARFIELD. 1945 or 1946. It was the tag end of the war.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any other occasion when you visited Russian ships?

Mr. GARFIELD. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall on one occasion there was shown a Russian film, *The Bear*?

Mr. GARFIELD. *The Bear* was written by Anton Chekov in 1870. It is the story of a man who comes to woo a widow, and it is kind of amusing, funny. They showed that picture. It is a one-act picture. This was on this particular occasion.

Mr. TAVENNER. This same occasion?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes. Somebody said we were shown a propaganda film called *The Bear*. You can go to any public library and read *The Bear* and you will see it has no such indication of any kind.

Mr. WALTER. It is a very old story?

Mr. GARFIELD. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe your name appears on a brief amicus curiae filed in the case of the Hollywood Ten before the Supreme Court?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe the brief was originally filed under the name of Alexander Meiklejohn, M-e-i-k-l-e-j-o-h-n. Will you tell us the circumstances under which you signed the brief?

Mr. GARFIELD. Well, I was asked to sign it, and I said I wouldn't sign it unless many other people signed it who were not in any way leftist, because I felt that I wouldn't want to lend my name to anything like that unless other people in the industry did; and they did.

MR. TAVENNER. How were arrangements made for you to join in?  
MR. GARFIELD. It was not joining in. Somebody approached me and asked if I would be a nice guy and do it. I said I wouldn't unless some other people did. They said, "All right, go get other people."

I thought I was being on the court's side when I signed this document, a friend of the court. I thought it was important that a man is never guilty until proven so, and it was on that principle and that alone that I signed that document, but I certainly was not the only one.

MR. WOOD. Do you recall who first approached you on that subject?

MR. GARFIELD. Well, as I explained to Mr. Russell or Mr. Wheeler—

MR. WOOD. We were not there at the time.

MR. GARFIELD. I vaguely remember being approached at the Beverly Hills Tennis Club.

MR. WOOD. And you can't recall who brought the conversation up?

MR. GARFIELD. They asked if it wasn't a person named Willner, and I said I wasn't sure if it was or wasn't. But this particular person, Mr. Chairman, was a member of that club, so it is possible he was the one that asked me. I am not sure on that.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you remember whether it was a man or a woman?

MR. GARFIELD. I can't remember if it was a man or a woman, but it is possible it might have been a woman. I can't honestly remember. But I know that is where I was asked, at the Beverly Hills Tennis Club.

MR. WOOD. Prior to that time had you ever signed a brief in the Supreme Court in any case?

MR. GARFIELD. No.

MR. WOOD. This was the only brief you had signed in the Supreme Court of the United States?

MR. GARFIELD. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WOOD. And you are unable, notwithstanding that was an event that occurred only once in your life, to give the committee the identity of the person who discussed it with you?

MR. GARFIELD. I would if I remembered. I have a vague recollection that this Willner person approached me. I am not sure. But I know I was approached at this tennis club.

MR. WOOD. The reason I asked that question, you have been rather positive in some of the things you have been asked about, that you not only did not sign a petition to join certain organizations but that you wouldn't do so, and here is an event it seems to me would be rather important in a man's life—

MR. GARFIELD. I signed this.

MR. WOOD. But would you have signed it if just anybody had walked up and asked you to?

MR. GARFIELD. Not if it was any stranger; no.

MR. WOOD. And you can't give the committee any further identification of the person who approached you on that subject than what you have given?

MR. GARFIELD. I tried to recall, as I said. If I knew it I would really gladly tell it, but I know I was approached at the Beverly Hills Tennis Club.

MR. WOOD. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Referring again to this party on board the Russian ship which you described, who else attended the party besides yourself?

Mr. GARFIELD. Mr. and Mrs. Louis Milestone; somebody from the State Department; Mr. and Mrs. Charles Chaplin; and my wife.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you say somebody from the State Department, or did you indicate Milestone was from the State Department?

Mr. GARFIELD. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the name of the person from the State Department?

Mr. GARFIELD. No. As a matter of fact, it was stated at the time that this was all being paid for by the State Department as a cultural gesture on our part.

Mr. TAVENNER. There was a witness before this committee by the name of Richard Collins. I believe he is employed by your studio?

Mr. GARFIELD. He was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is he now?

Mr. GARFIELD. Still is. He is writing a movie script for me. He is supposed to be writing a movie script.

Mr. TAVENNER. He testified here he had been a member of the Communist Party for a period of, I believe, 8 or 9 years, and that he left the party about 1948 or 1949. How long during that period of time was he employed by you?

Mr. GARFIELD. We just hired him about 4 months ago.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. You mentioned this party attended by Louis Milestone and others was given by the State Department?

Mr. GARFIELD. No.

Mr. VELDE. What was your statement?

Mr. GARFIELD. The State Department invited Mr. Semenov to the United States. He was entertained by many of the people in Hollywood—Warner Bros. and many others. He wanted to see motion-picture production in the United States, and he did. He reciprocated by giving a party on board ship. He gave the party. There was no political discussion of any kind. He couldn't speak English.

Mr. VELDE. The two meetings, then, were under the general sponsorship of the State Department?

Mr. GARFIELD. He was initially invited to the United States by the State Department.

Mr. VELDE. You mean——

Mr. GARFIELD. Mr. Semenov being a well-known screen writer and novelist.

Mr. VELDE. How did you know that?

Mr. GARFIELD. That was in the public press. He was on the Warner lot. We meet many people who come to the studios.

Mr. VELDE. That was the only way you knew him?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Go ahead with your further explanation.

Mr. GARFIELD. His returning gesture was, "Come and have a drink on the ship in San Pedro and see this picture." We went and had a drink and saw the picture. The press was there. It was common knowledge.



Mr. VELDE. You don't remember the name of the State Department official who was there? I am not accusing this member of the State Department of being a Communist or anything like that. I just think if the party was given for a member of the State Department you should remember who it was.

Mr. GARFIELD. I will try to make it clear. Mr. Semenov was invited here. He had an interpreter. The State Department was contributing the expense because they wanted better cultural relationship. They asked where he wanted to go, and he said, "Hollywood," because he was interested in motion pictures. Then he in turn gave this party at his expense.

Mr. VELDE. I understand that much of it. Do you remember anybody else who was present? Again, I am not trying to place Communist Party membership on anybody who was present.

Mr. GARFIELD. I understand. That is the best I can remember of that incident.

Mr. VELDE. That is all.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. First I want to compliment the witness upon his statement that he has always been against communism, that it is a tyranny which threatens our country and the peace of the world. And I feel morally inclined to express my opinion that nothing has been presented by the committee which associates you with the Communist Party.

Everyone who is brought before this committee is not necessarily accused of being a Communist, but is brought here to give such information as he may have on Communist activities or subversive activities. And I don't think anybody who is a liberal should be condemned in the slightest degree. Jefferson was a liberal, and so was Lincoln.

Mr. GARFIELD. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Garfield, I want to preface my questions with a few statements, too. I realize that you people in public life are subject to attempts from the Communist Party to get you to join it, to get you to use your influence to work for the cause of the Communist Party.

Neither do I want to question you because of your political affiliation with the Democratic Party. There are a lot of different shades of thought in the Democratic Party and in the Republican Party, and I might say there are a lot of different shades of thought in the Communist Party, but we recognize the Communist Party is an organization directed and controlled by the Government of Soviet Russia, and we recognize a conspiracy exists to overthrow all democratic nations of the world.

In your testimony you have, as our distinguished chairman said, remembered definitely a lot of things, and a lot of things you have forgotten. I want to straighten this matter out about whether or not you signed a petition to abolish this committee in 1947 or 1948?

Mr. GARFIELD. I say I never did sign.

Mr. VELDE. You are very positive you did not sign such a petition?

Mr. GARFIELD. Quite positive; yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Did you attend any meetings or do anything other than sign a petition?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes; I did.

Mr. VELDE. Will you go ahead and explain that?

Mr. GARFIELD. That was a meeting that had to do with the Committee for the First Amendment.

Mr. VELDE. And in that meeting that was held, did you recognize any other Communists—or any Communists, rather; I beg your pardon—did you recognize any Communists as being present?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know of any Communists during your experience in Hollywood or elsewhere?

Mr. GARFIELD. I said before that I did not, and I say again, very honestly and very truthfully.

Mr. VELDE. Yet you spoke of being very anti-Communist, and I think you said you did realize that there was a Communist organization in Hollywood?

Mr. GARFIELD. It was pretty obvious.

Mr. VELDE. When did you first come to this realization that there was a Communist Party in Hollywood?

Mr. GARFIELD. As I said before, when I quit the Wallace thing I felt he was being captured by a group of Communists. I didn't know these people personally, but that was my feeling.

Mr. VELDE. You didn't know before that time that there was a Communist Party organization in Hollywood?

Mr. GARFIELD. I did not.

Mr. VELDE. That was approximately what date that you decided there was a Communist movement in Hollywood?

Mr. GARFIELD. Late 1947 or 1948.

Mr. VELDE. Coming back to your early experience in Hollywood, I think you went there in 1938?

Mr. GARFIELD. 1938.

Mr. VELDE. Do you remember the time when Soviet Russia had signed a peace pact with Germany?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes. I recall also that I made a public statement in which I said I couldn't understand this position and was against it. I said so in a restaurant called Chasen's in 1939, in which I denounced this pact as a vicious thing. That motivated my action in going overseas before Pearl Harbor, when the Communists called the war imperialistic.

Mr. VELDE. By the way, I don't know if the question has been asked you before, but have you ever been in military service?

Mr. GARFIELD. No. I was inducted. I was in Italy when my draft came up, and I came back. They said, "Go home." They said I was too old, and I had two kids.

Mr. VELDE. At that time?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. You were reclassified?

Mr. GARFIELD. I was actually inducted in the Army and said goodbye and walked in, and they said, "Go home. You are too old."

Mr. VELDE. Who said that?

Mr. GARFIELD. The staff sergeant.

Mr. VELDE. Coming back to the Russian-German Pact, you know that there was a change in Communist Party line at that time?

Mr. GARFIELD. I only know how I felt.

Mr. VELDE. How did you feel?

Mr. GARFIELD. I felt that was a very, very dastardly thing, and I was against it. In fact, I was not only against it privately, but I stated so publicly, and I did something about it. I am opposed to any kind of dictatorship, whether communistic or Fascist.

Mr. VELDE. Did you ever have any reason to suspect any of your associates of being members of the Communist Party?

Mr. GARFIELD. As I said, the people who were mentioned here I knew purely and solely and honestly on a work basis. These things never entered my relationships with them. I had no relationships of that kind with them. Even if you look through the content of the pictures we made, there was no indication of that at all.

Mr. VELDE. You must have recognized that there was a Communist Party movement if you knew that they were trying to influence or propagandize pictures?

Mr. GARFIELD. As I said before, during this strike when we took this vote, 98.9 percent of the membership of the Screen Actors' Guild voted against this smaller group which was purportedly Communist-led. That was rumor. That was in the rumor department. That was how the Screen Actors' Guild felt about this purported group of Communists.

Mr. VELDE. Do you want to go on record as saying you had no knowledge whatsoever of any Communist Party movement in Hollywood until the time you broke with the Wallace Party?

Mr. GARFIELD. Absolutely and positively.

Mr. VELDE. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. General Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I note here, and I think I will speak for the minority members of this committee, that the Tenney committee, State of California, listed the Hollywood Democratic Committee as a subversive organization, but we of the minority don't consider the Democratic Party subversive by any means.

I would like to ask Mr. Garfield whether he ever made any statement regarding the Marshall plan?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes. I came back from Europe and I was questioned by reporters, and I made a statement which ran as follows: quote, "The Marshall plan is killing communism in Europe and that is good," quote, unquote.

It is interesting, by the way, that this was in the press and widely circulated.

Mr. KEARNEY. You say "quotes"; is that from memory?

Mr. GARFIELD. That is from fact.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is that from memory that you just gave?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is from the record as I have it, also.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Garfield, I am still afraid that I am not entirely convinced of the entire accuracy and entire cooperation you are giving this committee. It is your contention you did not know, during

the time you were in New York affiliated with the Group Theater, which for all its artistry was pretty well shot through with the philosophy of communism—

Mr. GARFIELD. That is not true.

Mr. JACKSON. That is a matter of opinion. You contend during all that time in New York you did not know a Communist?

Mr. GARFIELD. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON. And you contend that during the 7½ years or more that you were in Hollywood and in close contact with a situation in which a number of Communist cells were operating on a week-to-week basis, with electricians, actors, and every class represented, that during the entire period of time you were in Hollywood you did not know of your own personal knowledge a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GARFIELD. That is absolutely correct, because I was not a party member or associated in any shape, way, or form.

Mr. JACKSON. During that period it might interest you to know attempts were made to recruit me into the Communist Party, and I was making \$32.50 a week.

Mr. GARFIELD. They certainly stayed away from me, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Perhaps I looked like better material.

This picture, *He Ran All the Way*—who produced it?

Mr. GARFIELD. I did.

Mr. JACKSON. You produced it?

Mr. GARFIELD. I didn't have any screen credit for producing it, but I always work as coproducer.

Mr. JACKSON. The script was by whom?

Mr. GARFIELD. Guy Endore and Hugo Butler.

Mr. JACKSON. Who directed it?

Mr. GARFIELD. Jack Berry.

Mr. JACKSON. You have never been approached at any time to join the Communist Party?

Mr. GARFIELD. Never.

Mr. JACKSON. Nor have you been approached to assist at Communist Party functions, or functions of Communist-front organizations when you knew they were front organizations?

Mr. GARFIELD. That is right, Mr. Jackson. I might say, if at any time that had happened, I would have run like hell.

Mr. JACKSON. I must say, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, that I am still not satisfied.

One more question. I have before me a letter from the National Counsel of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, which states:

The Eighty-first Congress has a primary obligation action to protect the civil rights of the American people. For years now the constitutional rights, the reputations, the jobs, and the private lives of many of our citizens have been recklessly attacked by the irresponsible Committee on Un-American Activities.

This committee has been denounced by the President, by Members of the Congress, and by American leaders throughout the country. In its hearings it has failed to observe the most basic concept of Anglo-Saxon law. It has consistently used headline scare tactics to intimidate and to induce an atmosphere of fear and repression which is repugnant to our most precious American traditions. Its entire history has been one of flagrant violation of common decency and human liberty and has been an affront to one of the greatest institutions in our democracy—the American Congress.

The Eighty-first Congress can and must abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities. We urge immediate action toward this end.



You are listed as one of a number of signers. Did you or did you not sign it?

Mr. GARFIELD. May I ask the date of that, please?

Mr. JACKSON. The date of the letter is—the date is not given. Yes; it was received in January 1949. Is that right?

Mr. NIXON. That is the date we received it.

Mr. GARFIELD. I don't recall signing it.

Mr. JACKSON. You do not recall signing it?

Mr. GARFIELD. I do not recall signing it.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you subscribe to the statements made in the letter?

Mr. GARFIELD. No.

Mr. JACKSON. You repudiate the statements made in the letter?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Garfield, you told the committee of your activities in the liberal fields of endeavor. Other witnesses before the committee who have been so-called liberals have pointed out that the Communists have endeavored to recruit them, because at many points they use many activities to recruit so-called liberals into the party. In answer to a question by Mr. Jackson you stated you have never been recruited or approached to be recruited?

Mr. GARFIELD. That is true. No one has ever—

Mr. POTTER. No one has ever approached you to join the Communist Party?

Mr. GARFIELD. That is true, Mr. Potter. I was never approached.

I would like to add this for the record, if I may, my activities as a member of the Democratic Party. Officially, and from 1944 on, I have always been a registered Democrat. May I?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir. You may submit anything you desire for the information of the committee. I understand you also have a prepared statement, and, if you desire, you may submit that to the clerk and it will be received and used as the committee sees fit.

Proceed, Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Looking back, do you believe that any of the so-called liberal movements that you were affiliated with were used by the Communist Party, in looking back at it now?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir. They were captured like the Wallace thing; sure, they were used. But how do you protect people like me? That is what I want to know. That is why I feel we should outlaw the party. We are in a tough spot. Don't you think so, Mr. Potter?

Mr. POTTER. I agree the party should be outlawed. I would go along with that. It is difficult for me to understand how you could have been affiliated with organizations that, looking back now, you believe were being used by the Communist Party, and have so little knowledge as to the fact that they were being used.

Mr. GARFIELD. I was not affiliated with these organizations. Some of them used by name without my permission. I was not affiliated with any political party except the Democratic Party and the Liberal Party. I never attended any meetings of these groups. I attended board meetings of the Screen Actors' Guild 6 years, and the minutes speak for themselves.

I was also vice president and organizer with Bette Davis of the Hollywood Canteen in 1941. We raised \$600,000, with which we built the canteen. I sold over \$5,000,000 of bonds. I was a busy fellow, with a lot more things to do than getting involved with a lot of crackpots.

Mr. POTTER. Apparently the committee has received not only testimony but certain evidence from publications of alleged membership that you had that you now deny. Did you have knowledge of articles, for example, which appeared in the Daily Worker, which lauded you for such and such activities?

Mr. GARFIELD. I also have proof they panned me. I know the organizations I am a member of: YMCA, Hoyle Club, Democratic Club, B'nai B'rith.

Mr. POTTER. You don't appear to be a naive man.

Mr. GARFIELD. I am not, I don't think.

Mr. POTTER. It is difficult to understand. If I got lauded in the Daily Worker, I would begin to suspect—

Mr. GARFIELD. You mean anybody mentioned in the Daily Worker is suspect?

Mr. POTTER. I would try to find out what they were up to.

Mr. GARFIELD. Senator Taft was praised by the Daily Worker for his refusal to send troops to Europe. Does that mean he is on their team, so to speak?

Mr. POTTER. I think the reference to Senator Taft was a little different from the references I am speaking of here, and I am sure the Daily Worker has not made a constant effort to land the Senator. I am not asking about Senator Taft's activities. But it seems incredible that you could be identified with movements which, looking back now, the Communists have used, without suspecting it until the Wallace break.

Mr. GARFIELD. I was not identified with these people. I was never active in these organizations, Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Are you a joiner by nature?

Mr. GARFIELD. No; I am not a joiner by nature; I am not.

Mr. POTTER. Do you use any precautions to protect your name, to keep people from using your name when you don't want them to use it?

Mr. GARFIELD. How can you protect it when somebody writes you a letter and says, "If you don't answer in a week we will consider you a member"?

Mr. POTTER. I would answer it right away if I didn't want them to use my name; and, if they did, I would take every legal means available.

Mr. GARFIELD. I did, sir.

Mr. POTTER. Have you taken legal means?

Mr. GARFIELD. I have not taken legal means, but I intend to.

Mr. POTTER. You intend to. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder, did you have additional questions?

Mr. MOULDER. No questions; but, to answer Mr. Jackson's statement, I am convinced that no man should be convicted nor condemned on pure hearsay, rumor, or gossip. I sympathize with your position. Being one of the outstanding actors in this country, naturally you are going to be the subject of such rumor and gossip. I don't think any

man should be criticized because he is a liberal Republican or a liberal Democrat. The statement I made to you reminds me of an experience in my last campaign, when my opponent accused me of being a "pink."

Mr. JACKSON. The Democrats made similar charges.

Mr. MOULDER. He also accused me of making statements against this committee, which was not true.

I wish to reiterate my statement that your appearance before this committee does not of itself mean you are accused of being a Communist. I am clearly convinced from all the testimony adduced that you were never associated with the Communist Party or any Communist activity or subversive activity, and that you are a loyal American; and I compliment you on your vigilant fight against communism and your cooperation with this committee.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, so long as my name has been brought into this discussion, I would like to say I do not believe any man is guilty by association or anything of that sort. I am sure the gentleman from Missouri had no intention of accusing me of anything like that.

I do say that, for one who is as intelligent and as well established as this witness has proven himself to be, it shows a naive or unintelligent approach to this problem for him to have lived with this activity 10, 11, or 15 years and not know more about it than this witness knows.

Mr. GARFIELD. Mr. Jackson, may I answer that? I went overseas twice. I was too busy with war work. I am now conscious of what you are saying, more conscious than I ever was, but in that time I was more conscious of my bigger duty, which was to my country, and where I as an artist can contribute.

Mr. JACKSON. Unfortunately, the work in which you were engaged became more suspect than the work of those overseas.

Mr. GARFIELD. I was overseas. I wasn't here joining parties while they were shooting over there and dropping bombs.

Mr. JACKSON. A great many witnesses have been produced who were members of the Communist Party and working for the overthrow of the Government. That is why you are here—not because you are John Garfield. You are here because you were associated with an industry that has become suspect in the eyes of many people. You are here because we hope you can contribute something to this committee.

Mr. GARFIELD. I hope that I have. I hope sincerely that I have.

Mr. Chairman, may I read—

Mr. TAVENNER. I have another question. Is Mr. Hugo Butler still associated with you in a business way?

Mr. GARFIELD. No, sir; absolutely not. He hasn't been for the last 4 months—3 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean since these hearings began?

Mr. GARFIELD. Before—much before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where he is now?

Mr. GARFIELD. I have no idea.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of Jack Berry.

Mr. GARFIELD. He was the director—

Mr. TAVENNER. Director of your picture?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where he is?

Mr. GARFIELD. No. The picture was completed in November. That is the last I heard of him. I came to New York to do a play, Peer Gynt.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have been unsuccessful in locating either of them. We have subpoenas for them.

Mr. GARFIELD. May I read a brief statement of four sentences?

Mr. WOOD. Four sentences?

Mr. GARFIELD. Four sentences.

Mr. WOOD. The committee has heretofore ruled that statements should be submitted to the committee and not read. I have before me what I suppose is a copy of what you desire to read. I think it has already been included in your testimony, and for that reason I will permit you to read it.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. The statement was made that you belonged to organizations the purpose of which was the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. As I understand your testimony, you have emphatically denied that you belonged to such organizations?

Mr. GARFIELD. Yes, sir. Thank you.

Mr. JACKSON. Actors' Laboratory is listed as a subversive organization.

Mr. GARFIELD. I was never a member of that organization.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness appeared on behalf of Actors' Laboratory. I would correct my statement from "membership in" to "activity on behalf of" organizations that have been cited as subversive.

Mr. WOOD. Very well. Read your statement.

Mr. GARFIELD. When I was originally requested to appear before the committee, I said that I would answer all questions, fully and without any reservations, and that is what I have done. I have nothing to be ashamed of and nothing to hide. My life is an open book. I was glad to appear before you and talk with you. I am no Red. I am no "pink." I am no fellow traveler. I am a Democrat by politics, a liberal by inclination, and a loyal citizen of this country by every act of my life.

Mr. WOOD. Are there any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. I have one more question. I want to ask the witness whether he saw that article in the New York Daily Worker [indicating article].

Mr. GARFIELD. I never remember giving permission. I never saw it; no, sir.

Mr. VELDE. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason, Mr. Counsel, why the witness should not be excused from further attendance?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. I express my appreciation on behalf of the committee for your coming here and for the contribution you have made to our investigation. You may be excused under the subpoena.

Mr. NIZER. We have submitted a memorandum, with photostatic copies, supporting the whole record of Mr. Garfield in detail, and may we consider it as under oath? It hasn't been sworn to, but we should



like to submit the facts under oath. This was given to one of the investigators voluntarily.

Mr. Wood. I am told the investigators have a copy, so it will not be necessary to leave that additional copy. It will be filed for such use as the committee may determine.

The committee stands adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon, at 1:15 p. m. on Monday, April 23, 1951, an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, April 24, 1952, at 10 a. m.)



## COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION- PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 2

---

TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 1951

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

### PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to adjournment at 10:25 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Francis E. Walter (appearance as noted in transcript), Morgan M. Moulder (appearance as noted in transcript), James B. Frazier, Jr., Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, and Donald L. Jackson.

Staff members present: Frank S. Travenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; William A. Wheeler, Courtney E. Owens, and James Andrews, investigators; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; John W. Carrington, clerk; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. WOOD. The committee will be in order.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I would like to call as the first witness Mr. Marc Lawrence.

Mr. WOOD. Will you please raise your right hand and be sworn.

You solemnly swear the testimony you give before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I do, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, sir.

### TESTIMONY OF MARC LAWRENCE, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, MURDAUGH S. MADDEN

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Marc Lawrence?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes, sir, I am Marc Lawrence, and I am a motion picture actor. I have been an actor for 19 years in the motion picture business. I came to California in 1932, and in 1932 I worked around Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I interrupt you for a moment there. I want the record to show whether or not you are represented here by counsel. I assume you are.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes, sir, I am. This is Mr. Madden, my attorney.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you identify yourself for the record, giving your name and the location of your office?

Mr. MADDEN. Murdaugh S. Madden, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you a few preliminary questions first.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I was born in New York City in 1910. I attended public school. I went to high school, went to college. I left college after a year and a half. I then did a number of plays in New York. I came to California. In California I did a number of plays, too, and then following that I did motion-picture work. Now, around 1938, I believe it was, there were a number of—

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me interrupt you again for a moment. How do you spell your first name. I want to get you properly identified.

Mr. LAWRENCE. M-a-r-c.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that your name or is it a professional name?

Mr. LAWRENCE. That is my professional and legal name, sir. Professional and legal name.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your father's name?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Goldsmith.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name was legally changed?

Mr. LAWRENCE. That's correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. To Marc Lawrence?

Mr. LAWRENCE. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was it legally changed?

Mr. LAWRENCE. About 1940.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is sufficient. Now if you will proceed.

Mr. LAWRENCE. About 1938 I attended a number of "cause parties." This was not because I was interested at the time, but that is what happened: There was a girl who played the piano very well, and she introduced me to these parties. I went to these parties with her, and then I met an actor named Lionel Stander, who said to me, "You want to get to know how to talk to these people. The thing for you to do is to go to classes."

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, that was Lionel Stander?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Lionel Stander.

Mr. TAVENNER. S-t-a-n-d-e-r?

Mr. LAWRENCE. S-t-a-n-d-e-r, that is correct, sir. So I went to a number of classes with these guys.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was this? Did you state the date?

Mr. LAWRENCE. About 1938, sir. I went to a number of these parties where they used to read from the books and read the lectures, and intellectuals would tell stories, and it was very confusing.

Mr. TAVENNER. The stories of what?

Mr. LAWRENCE. They would read. Guys come in and they would read books. They would tell us, "This is what happened, and this is the reason for the war in Spain. This is what happened here, and that is what happened there." I got a lot of headaches listening to these guys.

I want to say this: That after I attended about 12 of these meetings, what happened was this. They came to me with a card and they said, "Sign this card, because you are a member of the party, but don't



sign your own name for security reasons." I didn't know what this meant. I was at the time interested in paying, you know, for the expenses of this thing, so I signed a name. Not my name. I picked it out of a newspaper, and that is what I signed. I don't know what name I signed.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't remember now the name that you used?

Mr. LAWRENCE. No, I don't sir. I never saw the card after that. Now, I want to tell that my appearance in motion pictures has been over a period of 19 years.

I have never considered myself a Communist, but this is the story of how it happened: After I attended a number of these meetings where they spoke to me—intellectuals spoke to me—I then went to cell meetings where the common chairmen, guys, would make speeches. These guys confused me. They gave me headaches. And they talked, and they kept telling me a lot of things like that. I didn't like speeches, because these things disturbed me. So I left after about 12 of these meetings.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder entered hearing room.)

Mr. LAWRENCE. Following that—this must have been in about 1939—I left and had no connection at all with the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, before you go any further, let's talk a little more about what occurred in 1938. You say you attended about 12 cell meetings?

Mr. LAWRENCE. About 12; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were these meetings held?

Mr. LAWRENCE. They were held in different homes in Hollywood. Some I remember; some of them I don't. I remember a guy named Lester Cole. Lester Cole was there, and the guy who introduced me to the party, Lionel Stander, he was there. There was Bob Rossen. I believe I attended some of his meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that Robert Rossen?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Robert Rossen, R-o-s-s-o-n or e-n. I believe that is the way you spell his name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Madelaine Ruthven a member of that cell with you?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I don't remember the name, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Waldo Salt a member?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I don't remember the name. I do remember that the classes we attended there was Dick Collins in the class.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is Richard Collins?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Richard Collins, that's right.

Mr. WOOD. Let the record show that Mr. Moulder of the committee is present now.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that Richard Collins was a member?

Mr. LAWRENCE. That's correct, as far as I knew. I didn't sign any card in his presence and he didn't sign any in my presence.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say he attended the cell meetings?

Mr. LAWRENCE. No, he attended the class meetings, where I first heard the ideas, where the ideas were first spoken. This is what I remember. Following that I think Richard and I were together in a class in the cell.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the cell?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. Now I want to get the names of those who were together with you in the Communist Party cell.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, let's see if I remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. You named a few moments ago Lester Cole.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he one of those in the cell with you?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes, he was at the time, that's correct; and there was Gordon Kahn.

Mr. TAVENNER. Gordon Kahn?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. K-a-h-n?

Mr. LAWRENCE. K-a-h-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that Lionel Stander was the one who introduced you into the Communist Party?

Mr. LAWRENCE. He was the guy that said to me, "Get to know this stuff and you will make out more with the dames." This is the guy. This is the introduction.

Mr. VELDE. What was that he said to you?

Mr. LAWRENCE. You get to know the dames more, with the line. I got confused a great deal. Now, this stuff really confused me. I thought at first it was a good idea. I went to the thing because I thought that you could learn something. I never learned anything.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, was he one of the persons who was in this cell with you, Lionel Stander?

Mr. LAWRENCE. He was; yes. Yes, of course he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now let us see if we can recall the names of any others.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes. There was Mr. Bromberg. I believe he was there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what Mr. Bromberg's first name and middle initials are?

Mr. LAWRENCE. J. Edward Bromberg.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any others in that particular group whose names you can recall?

Mr. LAWRENCE. It is very—I can't. If you mention the name, maybe I can remember the name. I maybe can remember the way he looked. But this is hard for me to identify. I want to say—

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned the name of Robert Rossen?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Rossen; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't know whether you identified him as being in this particular group or not. I would like to know whether he was.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Whether I met him at "cause parties" or not I don't remember, but I do recall at the time he was interested in the idea. Whether I saw him at one of the cell meetings, this is hard for me to identify, because there were a lot of parties at the time. I would like to say following this particular period, 1938—following this particular period I had nothing at all to do with the Communist Party. In 1944, I believe it was—No. The Actors' Lab were doing—the Actor's Lab is an acting organization in Hollywood. They were doing a lot of plays for the war effort, and about 1944 I contributed by doing a play for the war effort, and I toured up and down the coast, went to Army camps, went to hospitals, went to other places, and I did these plays for the USO. About this time—around this time, I think it was—there was a sort of a general cocktail party at which John

Howard Lawson made a speech about Russia and America, that Russia and America were Allies, capital and labor don't have to fight any more, and the thing to do is to believe this idea. Now, whether I signed or not at that time, I don't remember; but I do know a lot of guys of the lab said, "Come together and be in this thing, and it sounds great." So I followed a couple of the guys, and we signed up, I believe. I believe—I don't remember exactly—following that I attended about 12 cell meetings at the lab, where I saw Joe Bromberg and Morris Carnovsky. Oh, yes, whether at that time I signed a petition or not, I don't remember, but at that party, as I understand it, other guys did. I followed that. Now, then—

Mr. TAVENNER. This, you say, was in 1944 that you went back into the Communist Party?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I don't think I went back in. It was an idea. He said, "The Communist Party doesn't have to exist any more as a party." This was the idea—that we guys can say that there doesn't have to be a Communist Party, because Russia and America are friends.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they call it the Communist Political Association?

Mr. LAWRENCE. That's it, they did. They did call it the Communist Political Association.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then this was the period when the Communist Political Association was acting in the place of the Communist Party?

Mr. LAWRENCE. That's correct. That's correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that is when you again affiliated with the group?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes. I affiliated with the group only because I was working in the Actors' Lab.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this a group of persons within the Actors' Lab with which you affiliated?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes, there were a group of people. This was the time. Now, what they did at the Actors' Lab interested me more, because they were talking about actors' problems. That's why I became interested in it. They discussed plays that they were going to do at the lab. They discussed ideas for new plays, and so on and so forth, and I found it was interesting for me. So I went there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the names of those who were members with you in this cell within the Actors' Lab?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, there was J. Bromberg, J. Edward Bomberg, the man I mentioned before. There was Karen Morley. I don't know whether she was connected directly with the lab. I went to a meeting at her house. There was Morris Carnovsky.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us a little about Morris Carnovsky. How do you spell that?

Mr. LAWRENCE. C-a-r-n-o-v-s-k-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how he was employed at that time?

Mr. LAWRENCE. He was working in the industry. He was a motion-picture actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. A motion-picture actor?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party cell ever meet in his home to your knowledge?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes, I did meet in his home.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall how often you met in his home?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, maybe once every 2 weeks. There were meetings actually at the lab, too—the Actors' Lab. I attended many meetings at the lab. Since I was a member of the staff, I also taught motion-picture acting at the lab. I don't know how many meetings I attended at the lab or how many meetings I attended at Morris Carnovsky's house, but I do feel that I didn't attend too many party meetings, because this didn't interest me particularly. What interested me particularly were the problems of the actor. This was my main concern.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. Now, you have named three.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. J. Edward Bromberg, Karen Morley, and Morris Carnovsky. Were there others whose names you can now recall?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, there were kids at the lab that I don't recall, whose names I don't remember. They were also at the cell meetings. I don't remember them. This is what I do remember. This is actual. There was a meeting held at Karen Morley's house one night in which there was a kind of bunch of actors. Sterling Hayden was there. Larry Parks was there. They were discussing some big thing about what to do with the actors. There was a lot of fuss made at the time. And I remember Sterling and I remember Larry. I remember Anne Revere, Howard Da Silva, Lloyd Gough, and these people. That is what I do remember. Now, I don't know if these people were members of the Communist Party, but it was supposed to have been a closed cell. I couldn't identify these people.

Mr. KEARNEY. Was Gale Sondergaard there?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I don't remember her, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did you attend any Communist meetings with her, sir?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I don't remember, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will Geer?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I have never seen Will Geer at a Communist meeting, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, before we discuss the meeting at Karen Morley's, let us see if we can identify more persons who were members of this cell within Actors' Lab. You have named three. Can you recall any others?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, there was an actor called Jeff Corey who attended these meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. C-o-r-e-y?

Mr. LAWRENCE. C-o-r-e-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Larry Parks attend these meetings?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I saw Larry Parks at this big meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the big meeting?

Mr. LAWRENCE. At Karen Morley's house. That is where I saw Larry Parks.

Mr. WOOD. I wonder if you could speak a little bit louder. We can hardly hear you up here.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I am sorry. I am awfully sorry.

Mr. WOOD. A little more distinctly if you can.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was John Howard Lawson connected in any way with this particular cell?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I don't think he was, sir. The only meeting I remember with John Howard Lawson is when he spoke at this big



meeting for the preservation of America and Russia's alliance. This is what I do remember about John Howard Lawson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who usually acted as chairman of this group or cell?

Mr. LAWRENCE. The comrade chairmen. There were rotating chairmen. There were different chairmen every week. They were chosen by the people there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall any of those who acted as chairmen while you were present?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I was chairman once.

Mr. TAVENNER. On one occasion you were a chairman?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall others who served as chairmen?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Most of the people served as chairmen. Most of the people there. This wasn't assigned to any one person.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of this group having met at the home of Morris Carnovsky and that it also met at the Actor's Lab. Did it meet at the home of any of the other members?

Mr. LAWRENCE. At Joe Bromberg's house.

Mr. TAVENNER. How frequently did it meet there?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I wouldn't recall. I attended maybe one or two.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a secretary of this group, a person who served as secretary?

Mr. LAWRENCE. There must have been a secretary, because that was financial business. They came in and they asked you to contribute money. So there must have been a secretary there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you pay dues?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I paid a very small amount, sir. I am sorry I paid them a penny.

Mr. WOOD. I didn't get that.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I am sorry I ever paid them a penny.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the amounts of dues that you paid?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I paid a very nominal amount, maybe \$1 or \$2 a month. Something like that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall to whom you paid the money?

Mr. LAWRENCE. It was a girl who came up and called you into private session, and she said, "How much money do you want to give? How much money can you give?" And I didn't like to give any. I didn't give too much.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall her name?

Mr. LAWRENCE. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she a member of this particular cell?

Mr. LAWRENCE. She must have been, or an outsider that came in. She must have been.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you do not recall her name?

Mr. LAWRENCE. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us go back for a moment to this first group in 1938.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who acted as chairman of that particular group?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, there were different people, like Lester Cole and Gordon Kahn, and the other guys that gave the speeches.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you pay dues at that time?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall to whom you paid them?

Mr. LAWRENCE. It was the same arrangement then. They called you in and they asked you to pay money. And I didn't earn too much money at the time. I said, "I can't give too much money."

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall to whom you paid the money?

Mr. LAWRENCE. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of a large meeting held at the home of Karen Morley.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did it happen that you attended that meeting?

Mr. LAWRENCE. They called me. Somebody called me up and said, "Come to this meeting there and participate."

Mr. TAVENNER. This was a large group?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. This was not the cell that you had been a member of?

Mr. LAWRENCE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. A different group?

Mr. LAWRENCE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what kind of a meeting it was?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I know there was a lot of noise about what the actors should do in the Screen Actors' Guild. This was the tenor of the meeting. Sterling Hayden gave a big speech, and the other guys gave big speeches, and it was very exciting at the time. This I remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Sterling Hayden has testified before this committee that he was a member of the Communist Party cell and that he was directed to associate with a group working within the Screen Actors' Guild for the purpose of swinging the Screen Actors' Guild into support of the Conference of Studio Unions, which was out on a strike at that time.

Do you recall whether the meeting which you attended had to deal with that subject?

Mr. LAWRENCE. It might have, sir. It might have. Actually, I don't remember the details of it; but I know there was a lot of excitement at the time, tremendous amount of excitement, because following that there was a meeting at the Screen Actors' Guild in which the opposition, so-called, Communists defended their position against what the Screen Actors' Guild wanted to do at the time, and they were given the opportunity to do that. I didn't make any speeches.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become a member of any organizations that were known as Communist-front organizations which were later cited as Communist-front organizations?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I never identified my name with any such organization outside of this particular mistake that I made.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you never identified yourself with any groups of that kind other than the Communist Party?

Mr. LAWRENCE. That's correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which you now consider to have been a mistake?

Mr. LAWRENCE. A great mistake. A great and unholy mistake.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, I didn't believe myself to be a member of the Communist Party. I didn't believe myself to be a member of the Communist Party actually in terms of participation. I merely investi-

gated and wanted to hear. I wanted to see what these people had to say, and about 1946 I did one play for the Actors' Lab, and after that particular play I left the Actors' Lab and had nothing to do with any activity of the lab or any activity in the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the title of the play?

Mr. LAWRENCE. The title of the play was "Volpone." Following that I never came near the Actors' Lab or the organization of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say that was in 1946?

Mr. LAWRENCE. About 1946, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you had any affiliation or connection of any kind with the Communist Party since that time?

Mr. LAWRENCE. No, sir; I never have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Lawrence, it is rather unusual to find a person who was connected with the Communist Party and who at the same time was not affiliated with what is known as the Communist-front organization.

Were you ever requested to unite with a Communist-front organization?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Yes; I was, but I refused to cooperate in this way. I felt that what I was interested in was in seeking and trying to find out, but I never tried to participate as a man who had to lend his name. I always refused to lend my name to such organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. You indicate that your primary interest in uniting with the Communist Party was to investigate and find out what it was doing. What do you mean by that?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, I am a curious kind of "schmoe". I am the kind of a guy that listens to speeches. The guy comes over to me and says, "Listen. That sounds pretty good. Why don't you defend this idea?" And I got involved that way. I didn't defend the idea. I listened to the idea. I investigated the idea. I am not interested in the idea. I found that this is a very destructive thing. It has been to me. And I refused to participate in any way to destroy any of my present feelings about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I would like to make a contribution here. I feel that having been a member of the Communist Party has been a great error in my life, a hideous error. I have never in my life voted the Communist ticket. I have been a registered Democrat, and I have always voted Democratic Party. My feeling about the Communist Party is that it is a very destructive one. I will not in any way as a patriot defend any of its interests. I feel that strongly about it. I do wish further to say that I will defend this country in case of war with Russia. I will defend it with my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Lawrence, we appreciate the testimony that you have given us here in connection with some of the names of the people you met and that you were a member of the Communist Party.

You have referred to Robert Rossen. Will you describe your meeting with him? I think you said you met at his home.

Mr. LAWRENCE. It might have been parties at his home or cause parties at his home. I have never been in any cell meetings with Mr. Robert Rossen.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know where Mr. Rossen is at the present time?

Mr. LAWRENCE. No; I do not, sir.

Mr. VELDE. How long has it been since you have seen him?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I haven't seen Mr. Rossen in 7 years, maybe.

Mr. VELDE. Can you give any further details of your meetings with Mr. Rossen when he was present in the Communist Party meetings?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I wouldn't recall any, sir. I recall his face. I recall him as a man. That is all I recall, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Were you acquainted with Sylvia Morrow?

Mr. LAWRENCE. No.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Kearney?

Mr. KEARNEY. I also appreciate your testimony, Mr. Lawrence. There is only one question I have to ask you after your testimony.

Are you now fully convinced that the Communist Party has for its aims and objectives the overthrow of our representative form of government?

Mr. LAWRENCE. If I am not convinced, I would not come here to make the statement that I make.

Mr. KEARNEY. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Who called you for the Karen Morley meeting? Do you recall?

Mr. LAWRENCE. This I don't recall, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. You don't recall?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I just got a phone call.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know V. J. Jerome?

Mr. LAWRENCE. No.

Mr. JACKSON. You never met him?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I never met him.

Mr. JACKSON. I congratulate you upon your spendid memory. You should have less difficulty in learning scripts than some of the people who have appeared here.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I was a very nervous man today.

Mr. JACKSON. I congratulate you upon such straightforward testimony. I am much more impressed with it than I am with some that has been heard here the last few days.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Just one question. Have you identified all of the persons that you can now recall—

Mr. LAWRENCE. To the best of my knowledge, sir.

Mr. WOOD (continuing). Who attended any of these meetings while you were affiliated with the party?

Mr. LAWRENCE. To the best of my knowledge, I have identified those that I think I met and those I have seen.

Mr. WOOD. You have no further recollection of any?



Mr. LAWRENCE. If I have sir, I will communicate this information to you, if I recall any.

Mr. WOOD. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. VELDE. I have just one more question, Mr. Chairman.

When did you first become aware of the fact that there was a Communist movement in Hollywood?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Around 1938. This was when I went to these "cause parties," when there was a great deal of talk about Spain. And this piano-player girl who brought me to the place, she was interested at the time, so I went with her.

Mr. VELDE. Who was that piano player?

Mr. LAWRENCE. A piano player. A brunette who played the piano.

Mr. VELDE. I didn't get that.

Mr. LAWRENCE. A brunette who played the piano.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson, do you have a further question?

Mr. JACKSON. One. Mr. Lawrence, do you believe, out of your experience in Hollywood, that it would be possible to be around that community for a period of 8 or 10 years, before, during, and after the war, and not know that there was a Communist organization going on or a Communist organization within the industry at that time?

Mr. LAWRENCE. No; I am very apolitical.

Mr. JACKSON. You could be apolitical and still could know about this cell organization. Is it likely that the average person would know about such organization?

Mr. LAWRENCE. It is very likely they would, sir. It is very likely they would, but at the time I wasn't particularly interested.

Mr. JACKSON. Just in a general way, it would be extremely difficult not to know that there was a Communist-cell organization?

Mr. LAWRENCE. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. JACKSON. By the same token, it would be extremely farfetched to be around Hollywood for 10 years and not know a Communist, wouldn't it?

Mr. LAWRENCE. It might be possible.

Mr. JACKSON. It might be possible to be around Hollywood for 10 years—

Mr. LAWRENCE. I have never considered myself a Communist.

Mr. JACKSON. This is general. I am not trying to make any points so far as you are concerned. I am merely asking whether or not it would be extremely difficult to be in Hollywood during that period for 10 years and not know a Communist, wouldn't it?

Mr. LAWRENCE. That might be so. That's correct, sir. That's absolutely correct.

Mr. JACKSON. It might be so? You would not know?

Mr. LAWRENCE. That's correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Or it might be so, you would know? Perhaps if you consult with your counsel.

Mr. LAWRENCE (after consulting counsel). I still don't understand the question.

Mr. JACKSON. We have had some witnesses who have been wide-eyed with astonishment after 10 or 12 years in Hollywood, at the disclosure that there were Communists in Hollywood.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Well, that's silly. Of course that's silly.

Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason, Mr. Counsel, why this witness should not be excused from further attendance on this subpoena?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. I believe you are here in obedience to a subpoena?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Oh, yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Very well. You may be excused from further attendance.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, gentlemen.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. George Willner.

Mr. WOOD. Will you hold up your right hand and be sworn?

You solemnly swear the testimony you give before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WILLNER. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Let's have order please.

### TESTIMONY OF GEORGE WILLNER, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, MARTIN POPPER

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. George Willner?

Mr. WILLNER. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. WILLNER. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. POPPER. Martin Popper, 160 Broadway, New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Willner, will you state your full name, please?

Mr. WILLNER. My name is George Willner, W-i-l-l-n-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. WILLNER. I was born in Waterbury, Conn., on September 9, 1904.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your place of residence?

Mr. WILLNER. At the moment I live in Florida.

Mr. TAVENNER. What part of Florida?

Mr. WILLNER. Miami Beach.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. WILLNER. A writers' agent.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you married?

Mr. WILLNER. I am married; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your wife's name?

Mr. WILLNER. Tiba, T-i-b-a.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state briefly for the committee your educational training for your profession?

Mr. WILLNER. My educational training wasn't particularly for my profession. I had the normal education. I went to grade school in Waterbury, Conn., and Bridgeport; high school in Waterbury. I attended night school in New York, studying accountancy, for a couple of years. I went to school for a year in New York and learned draftsmanship.

(Representative Donald L. Jackson left hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. WILLNER. I believe I left Connecticut in 1920, to the best of my recollection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, now, will you state briefly what your record of employment has been since you finished your educational training.

Mr. WILLNER. Well, I had various jobs in New York—clerical, selling jobs, executive jobs. As I stated previously; I was an agent. Then I became a full partner.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by "agent"?

Mr. WILLNER. I was a writers' agent in Hollywood.

Mr. WOOD. The acoustics in this room are not too good. Would you mind elevating your voice a little so we can hear you up here.

Mr. WILLNER. I will try to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state what your clerical, selling, and executive positions were—I assume in New York—before you went to the west coast.

Mr. WILLNER. Well, I had many jobs in New York. I sold automobiles. I was superintendent of a furniture factory. I did clerical work for one or two insurance companies in the accounting department, among other jobs. I had many jobs.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the other jobs?

Mr. WILLNER. I worked for the American Sugar Refining Co. Have you any specific jobs you are referring to, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I have. Were you business manager of a publication known as New Masses in New York from 1936 to 1939?

Mr. WILLNER. Mr. Tavenner, the magazine New Masses happens to be one of those—one of many magazines and publications and organizations which are listed as subversive in the guide which this committee has put out. Therefore, as an American citizen I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment and refuse to answer this question on the ground that an answer might tend to incriminate me. You are trying to link me with one of those organizations which you list as subversive.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I object to the statement on the part of the witness and ask that it be stricken from the record.

Mr. WOOD. The statement that counsel for this committee is trying to link you with subversive organizations is not responsive to the question that was asked.

(Representative Francis E. Walter entered hearing room.)

Mr. WOOD. Please make your answers responsive to the question.

I understood you to say that you declined to answer the question that was asked you whether or not you acted in the capacity of business manager for a publication known as the New Masses, and that your declination to answer that question is based upon your claim that such an answer might tend to incriminate you, and that you claim the privilege of the fifth amendment of the Constitution. Is that correct?

(Representative Donald L. Jackson entered hearing room.)

Mr. WILLNER. That is partly correct.

Mr. WOOD. Will you finish it.

Mr. WILLNER. I think the answer is only partly correct, because I must give my reasons why I claim that privilege.

Mr. WOOD. Because the New Masses, as you contend, has been cited—

Mr. WILLNER. Not as I contend. As this committee contends.

Mr. WOOD (continuing). Has been cited by the Attorney General of the United States as being a subversive organization, and that an answer to an inquiry as to whether you have been interested as busi-

ness manager of it you contend, would tend to incriminate you. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLNER. Mr. Wood, I was an agent in Hollywood for many years.

Mr. WOOD. Please answer the questions that are asked you, Mr. Willner.

Mr. WILLNER. I believe I have answered the question.

Mr. WOOD. You can understand the questions that are asked you.

Mr. WILLNER. I certainly can.

Mr. WOOD. This committee is not endeavoring to link you anywhere. This committee is asking you what you have done in the past in linking yourself. You have the right to answer that question or not to answer it, as you determine, and you can offer whatever reasons you desire for your refusal to answer, if you do refuse.

Mr. WILLNER. I have given my reasons.

Mr. WOOD. But bear in mind, sir, that this committee isn't endeavoring to link you anywhere.

Mr. WILLNER. I feel that they are. I have given my reasons, and I stand on them.

Mr. WOOD. I am trying to disabuse your mind as to that.

Mr. WILLNER. It would be very difficult, Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD. A simple inquiry as to whether or not you have been identified as business manager of an organization is an effort to determine whether you have linked yourself with it or not. If you don't want to answer that question, then cloak yourself under the protection of the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States. That is your privilege.

Mr. WILLNER. I still stand on my answer, Mr. Wood.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you go to the west coast from New York?

Mr. WILLNER. I believe it was in 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. What work were you engaged in on the west coast when you first went there?

Mr. WILLNER. I will decline to answer that for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there an office of the New Masses in California in 1939?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer that question for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Charles Glenn, G-l-e-n-n, after your arrival in California?

Mr. WILLNER. I believe that name is one of those that have been characterized by this committee, and an answer to that question might tend to link me with Charles Glenn. Therefore, I shall decline to answer it for the same reasons as previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a volume containing the April 18, 1940, issue of Peoples' World, which has an article on the right-hand side of page 5 by Charles Glenn, entitled "New Masses Makes Its Mark in Los Angeles," in connection with which there appears a photograph of a person by the name of George Willner.

Will you examine that article and the photograph and state whether the photograph is a photograph of you [handing document to witness].



Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer that for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of this article by Charles Glenn there appears the following statement with reference to the magazine or publication New Masses:

Does it click? Well, in less than a year since the arrival of George Willner, west coast representative of New Masses, subscriptions have increased five times.

Do you have any comment you would like to make regarding that?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Further on in the article this statement appears:

We are one of the leading magazines, and don't you forget it. When the Department of Justice went fishing, they called on us because of our position for peace, our position for the Soviet Union, and for democracy and security. The FBI didn't catch any fish, incidentally.

Will you explain, if you know, what was meant by the statement that the publication stood for the Soviet Union?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Further on in the article reference is made to certain cultural accomplishments of the magazine, in which connection this language is used:

And in all fairness let it be said that many of these now famous ventures have been managed by George Willner and Tiba Garland, now west coast representatives of the magazine.

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is Tiba Garland the same person as your wife?

Mr. WILLNER. She is my wife.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of being in various executive positions in the city of New York prior to your going to Hollywood. Were you president of Central Distributing Agency of 52 West Fifteenth Street, New York City?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The reason that you previously stated was that the publication inquired about has been cited by this committee or the Attorney General as a Communist-front organization. Are you taking that same position with regard to the Central Distributing Agency? I have no information that such an organization has been cited by this committee or any other.

Mr. WILLNER (after consulting counsel). I decline to answer that question for the same grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which question is it you are declining to answer? My last question to you was whether or not you are basing your refusal to answer upon the claim that the concern known as Central Distributing Agency had been cited by the Attorney General or this committee.

Mr. WILLNER. I am basing my refusal to reply on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you make no further explanation of your refusal to answer?

Mr. WILLNER. I stand on my answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether the Central Distributing Agency has branches in Canada, the United States, Panama, and South America?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker, issued October 7, 1933, you were listed as a Communist Party candidate to the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York in the sixty-first district in Queens County. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to the August 28, 1934, issue of the Daily Worker, you were a Communist Party candidate for the assembly in the first district of Queens County. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker issue of July 16, 1935, carries a letter to the editor from one George Willner, of New York City. This letter was addressed to, and I quote, "Comrade Editor," and said:

There is no doubt in my mind, and this is the opinion of many Red builders with whom I have come in contact, that a sports section would aid the selling of the Daily Worker.

Did you write such a letter?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you be willing to give some description of the "Red builders" referred to in that letter?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee, Mr. Willner, is in possession of information that you held a 1944 Communist Party book bearing No. 48508. Did you hold such book?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of Branch 1 of the Northwest Section of Los Angeles County Communist Party?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time used the name "Paul Wolf"?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Willner, Mrs. Meta Reis Rosenberg testified before this committee on April 13, 1951. During her testimony she stated that she was at one time a member of the Communist Party and was assigned to a group or cell of which you were a member.

Do you wish to affirm or deny Mrs. Rosenberg's testimony?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer on the same grounds as previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that ground is that to answer might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. WILLNER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you consider it a crime to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer that question, Mr. Kearney, on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of being a writers' agent in Hollywood. When did you become a writers' agent?

Mr. WILLNER. I believe it was in the latter part of 1941 or early 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom?

Mr. WILLNER. I don't remember exactly.

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom were you employed?

Mr. WILLNER. I was employed by Mr. Nat Goldstone.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was known as the Nat Goldstone Agency?

Mr. WILLNER. I believe it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Through the cooperation of the Nat Goldstone Agency the committee has procured certain information regarding a contract for the selling to Warner Bros. of the screen play entitled "These Many Years."

I hand you a photostatic copy of booking information from the Nat Goldstone Agency, allegedly signed by you. I will ask you to examine it and identify the signature, if it is your signature [handing document to witness].

Is that your signature at the bottom?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. If I referred to the name "Goldstein," I meant "Goldstone." Does that change your answer?

Mr. WILLNER. I understood you to say "Goldstone," and I answered as if you had said "Goldstone."

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer this photostatic copy of the page of the record into the record of this case and ask that it be marked "Willner Exhibit No. 1."

(The document referred to above was marked "Willner Exhibit No. 1.")<sup>1</sup>

Mr. WOOD. After it is identified, would you hand it up here to the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

This exhibit, Willner Exhibit No. 1, shows that These Many Years, by J. Redmond Prior, was sold to Warner Bros., for \$20,000. The name of the artist, writer, and property is stated to be These Many Years, by J. Redmond Prior. Studio and individual who confirmed deal: Warner Bros., Budd Kay. It bears the date of March 1, 1948. Signature: George Willner.

Mr. WALTER. What was that name?

Mr. TAVENNER. Kay; K-a-y.

With whom did you negotiate for the purchase and sale of this picture?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know J. Redmond Prior?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I now hand you a paid check marked "Paid, March 4, 1948," bearing date of March 3, 1948, payable to J. Redmond Prior, on account of the Nat Goldstone Agency, in the amount of \$17,900.52, which check is endorsed on the back "J. Redmond Prior, Jeanne Cole; for deposit only."

Can you identify that check and state for what purpose it was given [handing document to witness]?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer that for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I offer the check in evidence and ask that it be marked "Willner Exhibit No. 2."

(The document referred to above was marked "Willner Exhibit No. 2.")<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See appendix, to follow hearings printed under this title, for photographic reproduction of Willner Exhibit No. 1.

<sup>2</sup> See appendix, to follow hearings printed under this title, for photographic reproduction of Willner Exhibit No. 2.

Mr. WOOD. It may be admitted.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Willner, is J. Redmond Prior the same person as Jeanne Cole?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Both of which names appear on the back of the check.

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer that for the same reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know who wrote the endorsement on the back of the check?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it not a fact known to you, Mr. Willner, that Jeanne Cole, whose name appears on the back of that check, is the wife of Lester Cole?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. And do you not also know that the maiden name of Jeanne Cole was Prior—that the last name was Prior?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is Lester Cole now selling under the name of Jeanne Cole?

Mr. WILLNER. Mr. Kearney, I decline to answer that for the same reason previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. You understand you are under oath here; don't you?

Mr. WILLNER. I certainly understand that.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Cole was one of the 10 Hollywood convicted writers?

Mr. WILLNER (after consulting counsel). I understand that to be so from the newspapers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Hyman Kraft, sometimes known as "Hy" Kraft?

Mr. WILLNER. I believe that name was mentioned in this committee, and again I say, Mr. Tavenner, I think you are trying to link me into an area, bring me into an area, which might be dangerous for me. Therefore, I shall decline to answer that on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman. I would like to have the witness answer this question: Why would knowledge of this individual whom counsel just mentioned tend to incriminate you in any crime?

Mr. WILLNER. Well, if you allow me to answer in my own way, I would be glad to answer that.

Mr. KEARNEY. As long as you don't go into a long haranguing speech; yes.

Mr. WILLNER. Well, for one thing, an attempt on my part to try to explain why might involve me in an area that might become an area which would be dangerous and tend to incriminate me.

Mr. KEARNEY. The mere fact that you knew an individual would incriminate you in any crime—any of these names that have been mentioned here today?

Mr. WILLNER (after consulting counsel). Mr. Kearney, I feel that question is one by which you might be trying to entrap me.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am not trying to entrap you at all. I simply asked you a simple question.



Mr. WILLNER. Mr. Kearney, people's names have been mentioned in this committee. I have noticed the following day they have lost their jobs. They have been guilty until proven innocent.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is that due to the fact that the names have been mentioned here or the company they keep?

Mr. WILLNER. I think it is probably due to the atmosphere in this hearing and the smell that comes from this hearing.

Mr. KEARNEY. I will say from the testimony of some of the witnesses, including yourself, that there is a terrific smell here.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Willner, you say you are a writers' agent. What sort of work does that entail?

Mr. WILLNER. Well, it involves the sale of literary materials—novels, books, original stories—to studios. It involves the securing of employment for writers who are paid for writing for the motion-picture screen.

Mr. WALTER. For whom have you obtained employment?

Mr. WILLNER. Well, I have been employed as an agent for approximately 10 years, and I have secured employment for literally hundreds of people. To be more specific—

Mr. WALTER. Whom did you obtain employment for since the 1st of January of this year?

Mr. WILLNER. I was unemployed as a writers' agent from the 1st of January of this year.

Mr. WALTER. During the last year of your employment as a writers' agent, whom did you obtain employment for?

Mr. WILLNER. Oh, there were any number of people. I had a big list of people. The agency had a very big clientele. I can't remember specifically. I can't remember them all. There may have been as many as 50, 60, or 100.

Mr. WALTER. Give us the names of some of the people that you obtained employment for.

Mr. WILLNER. Oh, I believe I obtained employment for James Edward Grant.

Mr. WALTER. James Edward Grant, did you say?

Mr. WILLNER. Yes; I did.

Mr. WALTER. Who else?

Mr. WILLNER. I believe Lesser Samuels.

Mr. WALTER. Lester Samuels?

Mr. WILLNER. Lesser—L-e-s-s-e-r—Samuels. There were very many. I can't recall them all.

Mr. WALTER. In your position you were able to recommend to the various studios the works of various people who sought your service; is that correct?

Mr. WILLNER. Well, not my services. The services of the particular writer involved.

Mr. WALTER. So, as I understand it, a writer would come to you with a manuscript and you would find a place for him to sell it; is that correct?

Mr. WILLNER. Yes; I would try to do that.

Mr. WALTER. Isn't that your job?

Mr. WILLNER. It was my job. It is not quite as simple as that, but I would say in its simplified form that is true.

Mr. WALTER. Whose manuscripts did you sell?

Mr. WILLNER. Well, besides the people who were under contract to us, we would receive manuscripts from various writers all over the country, people who lived in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago—various cities in the country.

Mr. WALTER. Did you obtain employment for Paul Jarrico?

Mr. WILLNER. I will refuse to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. WALTER. Did you obtain employment for Hugo Butler?

Mr. WILLNER. I will refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. WALTER. Did you obtain employment for Robert Lees?

Mr. WILLNER. I believe he is one of those who appeared before this committee. Therefore, I will refuse to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. WALTER. The fact of the matter is, you obtained employment for the three individuals whose names I just mentioned; didn't you?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. WALTER. A moment ago you were asked whether or not Jeanne Cole was the wife of Lester Cole, and you declined to answer the question on the ground that it might incriminate you. Why do you think that you would be incriminated if you knew that Jeanne and Lester Cole were husband and wife?

Mr. WILLNER. I feel this question is one—I don't know your name—Congressman Walter, in which you are trying to entrap me.

Mr. WALTER. There is no disposition or desire on the part of anybody to entrap you or any other witness.

Mr. WILLNER. That is a matter of opinion; isn't it?

Mr. WALTER. That is the accepted opinion of all but a few people who don't feel that they ought to assist us in our endeavors to expose the insidious machinations of certain groups. I want to know why you feel that you would be incriminated if you would answer the simple question as to whether or not Jeanne and Lester Cole were husband and wife.

Mr. WILLNER. I think you understand. The very intimation would tend to incriminate me, sir; and, therefore, I shall decline to answer that for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. WALTER. Why do you think you would be incriminated? By the way, what do you think "incriminating" means?

Mr. WILLNER. Well, there was an article in the last issue of the New Yorker magazine, for instance, which explained the work of this committee. It stated that a man might go to see a baseball game in Brooklyn, go there to see the Dodgers play, and might go there every day that the Dodgers were playing there and not necessarily be a Dodger fan.

I feel that because of the atmosphere created by this committee, because of the fact that there is such fear and terror in Hollywood today due to the actions of this committee and the cooperation it is getting from certain organizations, the Motion Picture Alliance in Hollywood, certain people who have lost their backbone, certain people who have suddenly become great singers.

Mr. WALTER. So that you refuse to answer because of an article that appeared in the New Yorker?

Mr. WILLNER. I refuse, sir, because it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. WALTER. I have always wondered where some people got their legal opinions from, and I know now.

Mr. WILLNER. You are also aware there is a Constitution and fifth amendment.

Mr. WALTER. I know a great deal about it, and I have fought to defend it, sir, on several occasions.

Now, how would you get into trouble if you would admit that you knew that a man and woman were husband and wife?

Mr. WILLNER. I believe I have already answered that. I stand on my answer.

Mr. WALTER. You know, of course, that when a witness decides not to answer a perfectly innocent question he must assume the consequences, don't you.

Mr. WILLNER (after consulting counsel). I know, first of all, that a witness has a right to stand on his constitutional privileges.

Mr. WALTER. I think the circuit in which you reside has stated the law to be just exactly what I have stated.

That is all, Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Willner, the record would reveal that you have refused to answer probably 99 percent of the questions propounded to you, for the alleged reason that it would tend to incriminate you. My study of the long history of this committee reveals—I don't remember of any person who has ever been incriminated as a result of truthfully testifying before the committee. And under the Federal statutes any testimony you may give here could not be used against you. Therefore, your refusal to testify so consistently leaves a strong inference that you are still an ardent follower of the Communist Party and its purpose. That's all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. WILLNER. I'd like to answer the question. I am consulting with my counsel. I am not an attorney, Mr. Moulder. I don't know whether you quoted the law correctly or not. I am inclined to think that you did not. I would say that the fact that I did not answer the questions that were put to me for the reasons that I gave in no way whatsoever implies what you have suggested.

Mr. WALTER. Is that a legal opinion from the New Yorker?

Mr. WILLNER. I'd recommend you to read that article.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. Along the same line Mr. Moulder asked, I would like to ask you if you know of anyone who has been incriminated before this committee for answering questions truthfully.

Mr. WILLNER. I haven't followed the whole history of this committee, and I wouldn't know the answer to that, Mr. Velde.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Willner, do you know today of any of the convicted 10 Hollywood writers who are now writing in Hollywood under assumed names?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. Going back to this check marked "Willner Exhibit No. 2," made payable to the order of J. Redmond Prior, and endorsed on the back thereof, "J. Redmond Prior, Jeanne Cole, for deposit only," do I understand you to refuse to testify that Jeanne Cole was the wife of Lester Cole?

Mr. WILLNER. I believe I answered that question. I stand on that answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. Would you answer it again?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. You decline to answer as to what you did answer?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer the question you just asked me on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know Mr. Cole?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know Lester Cole was cited for contempt of Congress by the House of Representatives on November 24, 1947?

Mr. WILLNER. As I stated previously, I have read about that in the newspapers.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know May 19, 1948, was the date set for his trial?

Mr. WILLNER. I can't recall such a date.

Mr. KEARNEY. On this check you know it is dated March 3, 1948?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. Two months before the date set for the trial of Mr. Cole, and the endorsement, as I said, on the back thereof is "J. Redmond Prior, Jeanne Cole, for deposit only." Is that correct?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. Even though I show it to you?

Mr. WILLNER. Even though you show it to me; yes, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, you wouldn't believe what you saw before your face?

Mr. WILLNER. I stand on my answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. Now, you spoke something about fear and terror in Hollywood because of the actions of this committee. Isn't it true that the fear and terror in Hollywood today is the result of the individuals' actions rather than the actions of this committee?

Mr. WILLNER. My answer to that is that I would say it would have to be traced directly to the action of this committee. I have found no instance—

Mr. KEARNEY. But you told us a minute ago in answer to one of Mr. Velde's questions that you didn't know the history of this committee.

Mr. WILLNER. I didn't say that, sir.

Mr. KEARNEY. What did you say?

Mr. WILLNER. I said I didn't know the entire history of this committee.

Mr. KEARNEY. All right, you didn't know the entire history of this committee then. Then that might go to the question that I just asked you, that the fear and terror in Hollywood today is the result of the machinations of certain individuals regarding their subversive activities against this country and not the actions of this committee. Isn't that so?



Mr. WILLNER. No, sir. I will have to state categorically that I think it is due directly to the actions of this committee.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you consider it a crime to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. KEARNEY. If it wasn't a crime, would you answer it?

Mr. WILLNER. I stand on my previous answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. You'd still refuse to answer?

Mr. WILLNER. For the grounds that I have previously stated I would refuse to answer.

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have only got one thing to say regarding the witness' testimony. I will say frankly that it is unworthy of belief, and I have only the utmost contempt for a witness who comes here and testifies in the manner this individual did this morning.

Mr. WILLNER. I would like to give my opinion of the committee since——

Mr. KEARNEY. You can give it to me outside any time you want.

Mr. WILLNER. I'd like to give it right here in the hearing room.

Mr. WOOD. Let's stay on the subject of the investigation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Willner, the studio negotiations for the picture *These Many Years* were conducted in the studio through Budd Kay. Is that my understanding?

Mr. WILLNER. I decline to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe—was that answer refused in your questioning?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; it was.

Mr. JACKSON. It was refused?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. I read from exhibit No. 1, which was the contract. The witness refused to answer any question relating to what that exhibit shows.

Mr. JACKSON. Reverting back for a moment, Mr. Willner, to your statement as to the fear and trembling and terror that is rampant in Hollywood today as an alleged result of the actions of this committee, would you think it would incriminate you to tell the names of some of these terrorized people to the committee? Who is in fear and trembling today in Hollywood?

(Representative Harold H. Velde left the hearing room.)

Mr. WILLNER. Well, obviously you don't understand Hollywood. I would say the whole community, no individuals——

Mr. JACKSON. I have lived in and around Hollywood much longer than you have, Mr. Willner. That happens to be my home community, so I am thoroughly conversant with Hollywood. I am not thoroughly conversant with some of the thinking that goes on in some of the minds in Hollywood. Would you give us the name of one person who stands in fear and trembling today?

Mr. WILLNER. Oh, there must be thousands of such people.

Mr. JACKSON. I am not asking for thousands. Give us one.

Mr. WILLNER. If you want one, I would say some of the witnesses that have appeared here have showed that fear.

Mr. JACKSON. That hasn't been obvious. Some have shown their arrogance. Many have shown their contempt. To the best of my knowledge, none of them has shown any fear and trembling since I have been a member of the committee.

Mr. WILLNER. Well, I was in the hearing room this morning. I heard one witness say that he was very fearful.

Mr. JACKSON. I don't recall the testimony. I saw a man who was ill and a man who had considerable courage.

That's all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Counsel, did you have any additional questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say that your employment ceased with the Nat Goldstone Agency about the first of the year.

Mr. WILLNER. No; I didn't say that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date that you mentioned?

Mr. WILLNER. It was approximately—I didn't mention any, but I will mention it now. It was August 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you become employed after that?

Mr. WILLNER. I have not been employed after that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you go to any other agency?

Mr. WILLNER. I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated in the early part of your testimony that you were engaged as an agent in Florida, as I understood your testimony.

Mr. WILLNER. I don't recall stating that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what did you state in regard to your employment in Florida?

Mr. WILLNER. I didn't state anything in regard to my employment in Florida. The answer was to a question as to where I reside. I said I resided in Florida.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you employed in Florida?

Mr. WILLNER. I am not employed in Florida.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been in Florida?

Mr. WILLNER. Oh, I'd say since approximately last October, October of 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why did you leave your employment with the Goldstone Agency?

Mr. WILLNER. I left for personal reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it voluntary or involuntary?

Mr. WILLNER. I wasn't employed at the time, sir. I was half owner of the agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you interested as an owner of the agency?

Mr. WILLNER. I would say for approximately 3 years. There were various stages. I believe in about 1945 I had a participating interest. That was increased as I went along, and I think it was 1947 that I became a full partner in the agency.

Mr. TAVENNER. By that you mean you had half interest in the agency?

Mr. WILLNER. I don't remember when I became a half owner. There was a time, I believe, when I was one-third, and then I became a full partner. That might have been in 1948 or thereabouts.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. A while ago, in response to the question I asked you or the statement which I made about your refusal to testify or answer questions leaving a strong inference, an impression that you were an ardent follower of the Communist Party and its objectives, in reply to that you said emphatically no, that it did not. Do you wish now to deny or affirm your belief in the Communist Party and its philosophies? Do I understand your reply to that to be that you deny your belief in the Communist Party and its objectives or any philosophy of the Communist Party?

Mr. WILLNER. It sounds altogether different as you now state it. What I was doing or what I was attempting to do was explain to you what the fifth amendment meant to me.

Mr. MOULDER. Would you answer the question: Do you believe in the Communist Party and its objectives?

Mr. WILLNER. You are just asking the question in a different way, sir, and I will stand on my previous answer and decline to answer.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Counselor, do you know of any reason why this witness shouldn't be excused from further attendance under this subpoena?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir; not at the present time.

Mr. WOOD. Very well, you may be excused.

Mr. WILLNER. Mr. Wood, you have allowed other witnesses to read a statement. I have a short statement. May I read that?

Mr. WOOD. I have seen the statement. It is quite lengthy. We will permit you to file it.

(The statement referred to was filed with the committee.)

(Witness excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Morris Carnovsky.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Carnovsky, you do solemnly swear the evidence you give before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF MORRIS CARNOVSKY, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, MARTIN POPPER

Mr. CARNOVSKY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that I be allowed to read my statement before this committee?

Mr. WOOD. We will permit you to file whatever statement you desire at the conclusion of your testimony.

Mr. CARNOVSKY. It is very short. I believe it gives a very good background of my whole point of view.

Mr. WOOD. First of all, we would like you to give heed to the questions that are going to be asked you, and answer the questions if you can, and—

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I was here yesterday—

Mr. WOOD (continuing). Then you shall be at liberty to file any statement you desire to file with the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Morris Carnovsky?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I am Morris Carnovsky.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. POPPER. Martin Popper, 160 Broadway, New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Carnovsky?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I was born in St. Louis, Mo., on September 5, 1897. I am 53.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you used any name other than the name that you have just given?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. That is my professional name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your professional name? Do you have any other name?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I have no other name. I was born with that name.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were born with that name?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. Yes.

Mr. POPPER. Excuse me. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that you are reading that [indicating prepared statement of the witness] in order to determine whether Mr. Carnovsky might read the statement in the record?

Mr. WOOD. I am reading it to determine whether or not it is going to be permitted to be filed with the committee.

Mr. POPPER. I see.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I am an actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you trace briefly for the committee both your educational background and your record of employment.

Mr. CARNOVSKY. Yes. I received the usual thorough, complete American education, beginning with grammar school in St. Louis, going on to high school for 4 years, and then 5 years in Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. I concentrated on literary subjects mainly, languages, a little philosophy, history, and I graduated with honor, Phi Beta Kappa, in 1920. I then almost immediately made up my mind to become an actor. I came east. I went to Boston for a season with a stock company, then continued on to New York, where it did not take me very long to become employed.

I started with a play at Provincetown Playhouse. I was noticed by the Theater Guild, who employed me in *The Failures*, *St. Joan*, and after a brief further interlude in stock I returned to New York. And then followed a wide variety of parts, characters, and leading parts, in a number of plays, classic and modern.

(Representative Harold H. Velde returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. CARNOVSKY (continuing). Of these there were plays by Maxwell Anderson, Shaw, Sidney Howard, and so on, a great variety of parts I played. I became known as an extremely competent character actor. I went to Hollywood, interrupting my stage career. I believe it was in 1935, if I am not mistaken, and appeared in the *Life of Emile Zola* at Warner Bros. Returning, I resumed my theatrical career and again played in *Edge of Darkness*. I believe, also at Warner's.

Finally I made my home in Hollywood. I believe this was in 1943, if I am not mistaken. I was asked to come out and play in *Rhapsody in Blue*, by Warner Bros. I played the father. And thereafter I have been a free-lance actor, with a few interims of coming back to New York and playing in plays.

I played a great number of parts in Hollywood, pictures like *Our Vines Have Tender Grapes*.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. What are some of the best well-known?



Mr. CARNOVSKY. I am mentioning them now. I believe Rhapsody in Blue, Our Vines Have Tender Grapes, and Cyrano, which was my last picture, possibly Cornered at RKO—I think these are the high points. An actor of my kind fills in with all kinds of engagements, takes pretty much what comes along. My last play was Ibsen's Enemy of the People, on Broadway, and on the road a play by Sam Behrman, called Let Me Hear the Melody. That brings me up to date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you spend any time outside of the continental limits of the United States?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. For a brief time I was in England, and I spent 4 days in France—Paris.

Mr. TAVENNER. What year was that?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. That was just before the war, 1937, I would say. Am I right? 1937.

Mr. TAVENNER. How much time did you spend abroad on that trip?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. Not very long. It was about—I think we were about 4 months in London and 4 days in Paris.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the only time you have traveled to the Continent?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. That is the only time; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were describing your activities and experience in New York. Were you a member of the Group Theater at that time?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. Mr. Tavenner, there are a number of organizations, all of which have been listed by this committee, of which the organization you just mentioned is one. I feel that I am here under a strong apprehension of danger in saying otherwise than that I now seek the protection of the fifth amendment and avail myself of my privilege to refuse to answer on the grounds that this would tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. So on that ground you refuse to answer the question about any alleged association of membership in the Group Theater?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. On that ground I refuse to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member or affiliated in any way with the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I decline to answer on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I decline to answer on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Progressive Citizens of America?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I decline to answer on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I decline to answer on the same ground.

Mr. TAVENNER. The American Peace Mobilization?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I decline to answer on the same ground.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Carnovsky, the committee is in possession of information that you held in 1944 a membership book in the Communist Party, bearing the number 48975. Did you hold such a book?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I decline to answer on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were present this morning during the testimony of Mr. Marc—M-a-r-c—Lawrence?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I was present.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you not?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You no doubt heard his statement that he attended Communist Party meetings in your home.

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I heard everything he said.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hear that statement?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I heard that statement.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that true?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. By that you mean that to answer the question of whether or not Communist Party meetings were held in your home might tend to subject you to criminal prosecution?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now or have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. Mr. Tavenner, there is no force in Government which can compel a citizen, as I understand it, to disclose his political, social, or religious affiliations. I regard this whole approach as unwarranted prying into the most secret and sacred areas of a man's thought. And since this has already been established in the work of this committee I regretfully and shamefully have to go on to claim my—

Mr. WOOD. Will you answer the question?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I believe I am answering it. I am about to come to my conclusion.

Mr. WOOD. You were asked a simple question, whether you are now or have ever been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I am giving my answer.

Mr. WOOD. Do you desire to answer?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I am answering it.

Mr. JACKSON. Is the answer "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. The answer is now that I claim the protection of the fifth amendment, and I decline to answer on the ground that this would incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEARNEY. I just have one question. When you took the stand here the chairman swore you to an oath in which you said you would tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Do you feel in your own mind and heart that you have fulfilled that oath?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I do, sir.

Mr. WALTER. As I understand your position, you feel that if you would admit that you were the holder of that Communist Party card you might be prosecuted in a criminal case for what you have admitted here. Is that correct?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I feel that under the fifth amendment I have the right to decline to answer that statement and that question, and I stand on it.

Mr. WALTER. But, now, let's get this straight. You are fearful, and that is why you invoke the protection given by the fifth amendment to people charged with crimes, that the testimony adduced here might be used against you in a criminal proceeding. Is that correct?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. That is as I understand it, sir; yes.

Mr. WALTER. Don't you know under the law any testimony given here cannot be used anywhere else?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. That is not the fact, Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. Do you get your legal opinions from the New Yorker, also?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I get my legal opinions basically from the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, the statute that I have referred to is a law enacted under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It was enacted for the very purpose of affording protection to people who come forward and assist congressional committees in fulfilling their obligation to the Congress and to the people of the United States. There is a statute that expressly protects the witness from any use of any testimony he gives in any other proceeding.

Mr. CARNOVSKY. Mr. Walter, it seems you have not read the recent case passed upon by the Supreme Court.

Mr. WALTER. What case was that? Why don't you answer, Mr. Popper?

Mr. POPPER. I think that is a good idea, sir, because I know you were a distinguished lawyer long before you were in Congress. The fact of the matter is the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly said, and said very recently, that there is no such thing as an immunity statute.

Mr. WALTER. I am not so certain this exact question has been passed upon.

Mr. POPPER. Oh, yes. May I refer you to United States against Bryan.

Mr. WALTER. Yes. I know the case.

You still decline to answer because you are afraid you might be prosecuted criminally for any testimony you give. Is that correct?

Mr. CARNOVSKY. I refuse to answer, because this might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. No, thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Further questions?

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Counselor, is there any reason why this witness shouldn't be excused from further attendance?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. WOOD. We will take a recess until 10 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. POPPER. Mr. Chairman, may I merely say this: One witness here was subpoenaed twice. That witness is Mr. Carnovsky, one subpoena returnable yesterday and one tomorrow. I take it you are excusing him in connection with both subpoenas.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Yes. This witness is excused.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p. m., the committee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a. m., April 25, 1951.)





## COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION- PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 2

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 1951

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

### PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:20 a. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman), presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Francis E. Walter, James B. Frazier, Jr., Harold H. Velde (appearance as noted in transcript), Bernard W. Kearney (appearance as noted in transcript), Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; William A. Wheeler, investigator; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. Wood. Let the committee be in order, please.

Let the record show that there are present members of the committee as follows: Mr. Walter, Mr. Frazier, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Potter, and Mr. Wood, a quorum of the full committee.

In the light of certain testimony given before this committee concerning the inability of the staff and others to serve subpoenas on certain parties in the State of California, I am pleased to announce that Mr. Bercovici of 10520 Garwood Place, Los Angeles, has reported to the marshal's office in Los Angeles and accepted service of his subpoena.

The Jack Berry who was mentioned in that testimony is the Jack Berry who lives at 935 North Kings Road, Hollywood, Calif., and should not be confused with the Jack Berry who resides at 77 Park Avenue, New York, and who is a radio writer. I make that announcement so that no injustice will be done him.

Who is your first witness, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call as the first witness this morning Mr. Abraham Polonsky.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Polonsky, will you raise your right hand, please, and be sworn? You solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. POLONSKY. I do.

Mr. Wood. Have a seat.

TESTIMONY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN POLONSKY, ACCOMPANIED BY  
HIS COUNSEL, MARTIN POPPER

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. POLONSKY. Abraham Lincoln Polonsky.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented here by counsel?

Mr. POLONSKY. Yes, I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. POPPER. Martin Popper, 160 Broadway, New York.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Polonsky, will you give the committee a brief statement of your educational background; but before doing so, will you state when and where you were born?

Mr. POLONSKY. I was born in New York City, December 5, 1910.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what is your profession?

Mr. POLONSKY. I am a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now will you state what your educational training has been?

Mr. POLONSKY. I went to the public schools in New York City; went to the College of the City of New York, and to Columbia Law School.

(Representative Harold H. Velde entered hearing room.)

Mr. WOOD. Just a moment. Let the record show that Mr. Velde of the committee is here. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you live at the present time?

Mr. POLONSKY. In Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived there?

Mr. POLONSKY. Since I returned from overseas in 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you lived there prior to that time?

Mr. POLONSKY. I went out in 1937 for, I think, some 4 to 6 months; and once before that in the early part of 1944, I think it was February, on official business for the Government, in order to get released from a Paramount contract.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe it will be a lot better if you state in your own way what your record of employment has been since you completed your education.

Mr. POLONSKY. You mean as a writer, mainly?

Mr. TAVENNER. Principally; yes.

Mr. POLONSKY. I started to work in the radio business toward the end of 1936, and I worked in radio until toward the end of 1943, and I also wrote several books in that time, and stories and serials for the magazines.

After that, beginning in 1945, I began to work in motion pictures, and I have worked there since with the exception of some stories that I wrote for magazines and a novel recently published by Little, Brown & Co.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you begin working in moving pictures?

Mr. POLONSKY. In March or April 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were some of the principal productions with which you were connected?

Mr. POLONSKY. Well, I got a screen credit on a picture in which Marlene Dietrich appeared called Golden Earrings. I wrote the screen play, Body and Soul, and collaborated in writing the play Force of Evil, and was sole author of the screen play, I Can Get It for You Wholesale.

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom are you now employed?

Mr. POLONSKY. I am unemployed. I was employed at 20th Century-Fox until this business started, and then I was released.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of the production of *Body and Soul*. Who was the producer of that play?

Mr. POLONSKY. I am not quite sure. It was Enterprise Pictures, I suppose, and Garfield's company. They borrowed me from Paramount Pictures to write the screen play, and I came over there to write the screen play on a production that had not come through, and I wrote a brand new story for it. Then I was released from my Paramount contract and worked for Enterprise until I went to Europe, and when I returned I went to work for 20th Century-Fox.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the star of that play?

Mr. POLONSKY. *Body and Soul*?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. POLONSKY. John Garfield.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the director?

Mr. POLONSKY. Robert Rossen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become interested in any way in the firm which produced that?

Mr. POLONSKY. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that before or after the production of *Body and Soul*?

Mr. POLONSKY. It was after the success of *Body and Soul*. They made me what you might call a nominal vice president of the company. I never received money for that, but for the work I did as writer and director. I had no financial or stock interest in the company.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were in the company besides yourself?

Mr. POLONSKY. Well, it is hard to say, because I didn't pay much attention to it, but Garfield, I think, was the president.

Mr. TAVENNER. What Garfield?

Mr. POLONSKY. John Garfield. Mr. Garfield was the president, and I was vice president, and I think Mr. Garfield's business agent was secretary or treasurer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who is your business agent, or was your business agent?

Mr. POLONSKY. You mean my business agent, or my agent for the motion pictures?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, agent for the motion pictures.

Mr. POLONSKY. William Morris & Co.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of various guilds in Hollywood, such as the Radio Writers' Guild?

Mr. POLONSKY. I am a member of all the writing guilds—Radio Writers' Guild, Dramatists' Guild, Authors' League, Screen Writers' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hold an official position in any of them?

Mr. POLONSKY. No; I have not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you an official of Actors' Laboratory?

Mr. POLONSKY. This is a question we will have to talk about here. I am going to refuse to answer that question, sir, and claim the protection under the fifth amendment, the right against self-incrimination, the right not to testify against myself, and insofar as the first amendment is relevant to it, I would like to use that too.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand from what you say that you were a member of the Radio Writers' Guild?

Mr. POLONSKY. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Out of your interest in that particular field, did you become one of the 13 incorporators of the Hollywood Community Radio Group?

Mr. POLONSKY. I am going to refuse to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated, although I would like to say that if you would divide your question up, there is no relationship between the Radio Writers' Guild and the organization you mentioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. I didn't mean to infer there was, but out of your interest as a radio writer, were you interested in the formation of a corporation, of which you were a director, which had for its purpose the acquisition of a radio station?

Mr. POLONSKY. I am going to have to refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you photostatic copy of articles of incorporation of the Hollywood Community Radio Group, bearing the names of the applicants for the charter, and I notice there the signatory in ink of Abraham L. Polonsky. Will you examine that and state whether or not it is your signature?

Mr. POLONSKY (after examining document and consulting with his counsel). I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Polonsky, hearings were conducted by the Federal Communications Commission with regard to the licensing of the operations of a broadcasting station to the Hollywood Community Radio Group on December 19, 1946. An examination of the record of those hearings shows that on that day you appeared as a witness and testified before the Commission, and that in the course of your testimony the following questions and answers appear, both on cross-examination and on redirect examination, which I desire to read to you.

Cross-examination by Mr. Welch:

Question. Would you permit someone to broadcast over your station espousing the views of communism?

Answer. I would permit Communists to broadcast over our station as long as they are a legal entity.

Question. Espousing the views of communism?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. That is all.

Then on redirect examination by Mr. Rosenberg:

Question. On cross-examination, Mr. Polonsky, I believe you testified that you would permit the Communists espousing the cause of communism to broadcast over your station so long as the Communist Party was legal in the United States; is that correct?

Answer. I said that.

Question. Would you permit Communists espousing the cause of communism so to broadcast under any and all circumstances?

Answer. I should say not.

Question. What circumstances would you permit them to broadcast under?

Answer. Well, in terms of the discussion that I had with you during the intermission—well, he asked me that question and I will answer it. I feel only that if it is public controversy in which the subject affects the interests of all the people who could listen to our station and they want to hear the various sides of the issue and the Communist side was one of the sides to it, then I think so long as the Communist Party is legal in the United States, they should have



the right to present their side of the case, but I would not permit the station to be used as a platform by the Communists or anybody else.

Question. Will you state what you mean by the discussion you had with me on the subject after the recess?

Answer. Yes. You asked what I meant by that statement, whether I meant that station could be used as a platform, and I said not.

Question. Did you state in substance what you have just stated on the witness stand?

Answer. That is correct.

Mr. POLONSKY. Was there a question that you have addressed to me?

Mr. TAVENNER. I have read that testimony to you, and I am now going to ask you a question based on that testimony. Did those views as appear on the record of the hearing, of the propriety of the use of the radio station by Communists, apply equally to the use of the moving-picture industry in connection with Communist activities?

Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated, because I feel that in moving into this realm of discussion I may tend to incriminate myself or testify against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you refuse to answer whether your views with regard to the use of radio stations by Communists coincide with your views regarding the use of the moving-picture industry by Communists?

Mr. POLONSKY. May I consult my counsel, please? [After consulting his counsel.] I am going to stand on my previous answer, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You referred to the fact that you were a member of the Office of Strategic Services, or employed by them?

Mr. POLONSKY. I didn't, but I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say you had been overseas?

Mr. POLONSKY. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. With the Office of Strategic Services?

Mr. POLONSKY. I didn't mention the name. I just said I was overseas. But I was employed by them.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your employment?

Mr. POLONSKY. Well, I am reluctant to answer that question because I feel that—

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me qualify the question. I do not ask you to state to the committee anything of a confidential character or secret character in connection with your employment in that service.

Mr. POLONSKY. Yes. I was involved in the clandestine black radio operations in France and England.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you so employed?

Mr. POLONSKY. I went overseas, I believe, in the middle of April 1944, and I returned to the United States toward the end of February, I believe, in 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. In securing a position with the Office of Strategic Services, did you sign this statement, or did you make this answer to an inquiry that is made, the inquiry being as follows: "Did you ever have or do you now have membership in or support any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States?" To which question there is written the word "No."

Do you recall executing that statement which I now hand to you for you to examine, the form being known as Form 47?

Mr. POLONSKY (after examining document and consulting with his counsel). I signed a lot of forms at that time, and that looks like one of the many I did sign.

Mr. WOOD. I didn't understand the witness.

Mr. POLONSKY. I said I signed a great many forms at that time, and this looks like one of the many forms I did sign.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you satisfied you did sign that particular form and you gave the answer of "No" to the question asked?

Mr. POLONSKY. That is my signature there, and my handwriting.

Mr. TAVENNER. If that statement was made by you at that time, was it a truthful statement?

Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you refuse to answer whether or not the statement that you were not a member of such an organization as described there was truthful, on the ground it might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. POLONSKY. In the light of the general context of the way things are now, and in the light of the position I am in now, I refuse to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to correct at this time a statement I made a few minutes ago. I referred to the form as being Form 47. It appears on the face of it, it is OSS Form 2205. I assume that does not change your answer?

Mr. POLONSKY. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. There have been several witnesses who have appeared before the committee during the course of these hearings who have described their own participation and membership in the Communist Party, and who have also made reference to your alleged membership in the Communist Party, and who have referred to meetings of the Communist Party which were held in your home. The committee is inquiring into these activities, and I would like to ask you this specific question: The witness, Mr. Sterling Hayden, as appears on page 34 of the transcript of his testimony, was asked this question:

Question. Do you know an individual by the name of Abe Polonsky?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The meetings were frequently held at Abe's house.

Question. Was he a member of this group?

Mr. HAYDEN. He was later. About the time I terminated he began to show up at meetings. In the early stages of the proceedings he did not sit in on these meetings as I remember it.

Question. Was he known to you as a member of the Communist Party, from your association with him?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Do you desire to affirm, deny, or explain in any manner the statement made by Mr. Hayden under oath?

Mr. POLONSKY. I have indicated to counsel here that I am going to refuse to answer all such questions on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. WOOD. Do you refuse to answer this question?

Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer this question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The witness Mrs. Meta Rosenberg testified before this committee on April 13—Mr. Sterling Hayden having testified on April 10—and at page 73 of the transcript Mrs. Rosenberg is shown to have been asked this question:

Tell us who were in this second group, and in giving us the names of them, state also whether or not they were connected with the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, and if you can recall, in what capacity.

By the "second group," previous to that question I had asked her what she meant by second group by this question: "Of the Communist Party?" to which she replied, "Yes."

Then, to the question I read, Mrs. Rosenberg made this answer:

Well, the first one that comes to my mind, the most natural one, of course, is Robert Rossen, who was the second chairman of the Mobilization.

There was Abe Polonsky. I don't know that he had any special job in the Mobilization. He did a good deal of work. He is a very brilliant writer.

Do you desire to deny, affirm, or explain that testimony in any manner?

Mr. POLONSKY. What is the date of that, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. The date is April 13, the date of her testimony.

Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were associated with and connected with the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, were you not?

Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The witness Richard Collins testified before this committee on April 12, 1951, and on page 69 of the transcript it appears that this question was asked:

QUESTION. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Abe Polonsky?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

QUESTION. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Do you desire to offer any explanation by way of affirmation or denial of that statement?

Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated?

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted in California with a person by the name of Sidney Benson, or Sid Benson?

Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Naomi Willett, W-i-l-l-e-t-t, often referred to as Betty Willett?

Mr. POLONSKY (after consulting his counsel). To the best of my knowledge I have no recollection of that name or any name like that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall of such person ever coming to your home?

Mr. POLONSKY. I have no recollection whatsoever of any such person, even the existence of any such person.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall a meeting in your home attended by Waldo Salt, Samuel Moore——

Mr. WOOD. Spell it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Waldo Salt, S-a-l-t; Samuel Moore; John Stapp, S-t-a-p-p; Charles Glenn; and John Howard Lawson. And in asking you this question, it has no relationship to the individual about whom I asked you a moment ago.

Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated with the Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a member of its steering committee in 1950?



Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated. Those are all organizations that have been characterized by this committee——

Mr. TAVENNER. As Communist-front organizations. Were you affiliated with any such organizations?

Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee what the purposes of any of these organizations were, such as the one I just mentioned, the Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

Mr. POLONSKY (after consulting his counsel). I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Communist Party at this time?

Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Polonsky, who recommended you for your position with OSS?

Mr. POLONSKY. Mr. Walter, I am very reluctant to answer that question, and I would not like to answer that question unless this committee actually forces me to do so, because although I have had no contact with any of the men in that organization since the period of the war and immediately afterward—I think once—they may still be involved in the intelligence services of the United States and their names are not a matter of public knowledge at this time.

Mr. WALTER. You weren't just plucked out of thin air. OSS somehow or other got in contact with you and you were given the employment.

Mr. POLONSKY. I was recruited by someone into OSS.

Mr. WALTER. Where were you when you were recruited?

Mr. POLONSKY. In New York.

Mr. WALTER. Who was it recruited you?

Mr. POLONSKY. This is the name of one of these gentlemen whom I mentioned, and, of course, if the committee insists upon my answering that question I will, but——

Mr. WALTER. How long had you known that individual?

Mr. POLONSKY. I had not known him at all before that time.

Mr. WALTER. A perfect stranger came to you and asked you if you would be available for service in the OSS; is that right?

Mr. POLONSKY. He was a stranger to me at that time.

Mr. WALTER. Do you know how he came to know that you could perform some service for the OSS?

Mr. POLONSKY. May I discuss this for a moment with my counsel, please.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

(Witness consults with his counsel.)

Mr. POLONSKY. I am reluctant to answer any questions around that subject, sir, unless the committee is willing to take responsibility for it, because at the time I left OSS, although I did not swear not to tell or anything like that, there was a moral understanding that we would not discuss these questions, but if the committee forces me to I will give the names of the people, but I have to caution the com-



mittee that they may be involved in intelligence activities at this time. (Representative Bernard W. Kearney entered hearing room.)

Mr. WALTER. Have you any relatives in Russia?

Mr. POLONSKY. I wouldn't know. My father was born in Russia, so was my mother, or in Poland, I am not sure, and there may be relatives there.

Mr. WALTER. I believe your father-in-law and mother-in-law were also born in Russia?

Mr. POLONSKY. That is true, or Poland.

Mr. WALTER. You don't know of any relatives you may have in Russia?

Mr. POLONSKY. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. You haven't been in contact with any of your relatives in Russia?

Mr. POLONSKY. I have never been in contact with them.

Mr. WALTER. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Polonsky, is your wife's name Sylvia Morrow?

Mr. POLONSKY. Sylvia Marrow, M-a-r-r-o-w.

Mr. VELDE. Did you formerly live in New York City?

Mr. POLONSKY. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. You and your wife?

Mr. POLONSKY. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Did you move to Los Angeles about 1944?

Mr. POLONSKY. No, sir. Well, I am not sure about that. I took up residence in Los Angeles myself, that is, when I returned from the war, and my wife came at some other period, I think while I was overseas. There was a period of 2 weeks in the early part of 1944 when I went to Paramount to get a cover story for my departure abroad, and to explain why I could not continue under my motion-picture contract, and I also got my shots.

Mr. VELDE. Is your wife a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have any knowledge that there is a Communist movement in Hollywood?

Mr. POLONSKY. That seems to go to the general sense of the questions which I said that I must not answer in order not to incriminate myself, sir, and I refuse to answer that question.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Polonsky, in refusing to answer these questions, I presume you know that you leave us—or me, at least—with the impression that you have been and still are a member of the Communist Party. Further than that, in refusing to answer whether or not you signed a loyalty oath when you went into OSS, you leave me with the impression that you are a very dangerous citizen. That is all.

Mr. POLONSKY. Do you wish me to comment upon that, sir? When I cite the fifth amendment in order not to incriminate myself, I am not affirming or denying anything. I am doing that because of the context of things today.

Mr. WOOD. I am unwilling to let that statement go unchallenged. When a man says, in answer to a question of whether or not he is a member of an organization that has been cited by an arm of this Gov-

ernment as subversive, that he refuses to answer on grounds of self-incrimination, he means one of two things to any reasonable person, either that if he tells the truth he is a member, or that if he denied membership he perjures himself.

I am not willing to let the statement go unchallenged that your answer might be "No." It would either, in your opinion, incriminate you to answer it truthfully, or your statement that you hide behind the fifth amendment is a false statement. So let's not have any misunderstanding about that.

MR. POLONSKY. But that is not the meaning of the fifth amendment as I understand it and as the courts have stated it. It is one of the most basic and fundamental rights under the Constitution.

MR. WOOD. Absolutely, and no member of this committee seeks to place any impediment in the way of anyone using it, but when he uses it and then says he leaves the inference he is not a member of the organization interrogated about, it doesn't make sense.

MR. POLONSKY. I am not trying to leave that implication. The Founding Fathers wrote the fifth amendment for this type of interrogation. Am I right about that?

MR. WALTER. No, no, no; you are not right at all. I suggest you read the debates. That was not the purpose of the fifth amendment at all.

MR. POLONSKY. As I remember, the special courts of inquiry at that time, the inquisitorial courts, the Founding Fathers, had the idea that such a thing might occur, that people might be brought up under subpoena or some other way and forced to speak about things that might incriminate them about their political ideas, their conscience, their morality, their feelings, and it was felt at that time—and I feel it very deeply myself—that what the Constitution means, what the fifth and first amendments mean, is that this is a kind of country where there is thorough freedom for those things. And it doesn't seem to me the committee should attempt to characterize my answers, where I use the fifth amendment, as Mr. Velde does when he says he thinks I am a dangerous man.

MR. WALTER. You would with one breath use the fifth amendment, and with the second breath deprive us of our right to reach a conclusion.

MR. POLONSKY. I am not trying to deprive you of any right.

MR. WALTER. You do deprive us of our right to reach the conclusion stated by Mr. Velde, and I think he speaks for all of us.

MR. KEARNEY. Do you think the Founding Fathers had in mind the ultimate formation of the Committee on Un-American Activities?

MR. POLONSKY. I don't know, sir, but this committee has, in its actions—and I am not characterizing this committee—

MR. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I see no reason to ask further questions of this witness. He is following a pattern that apparently has been rehearsed by witness after witness.

MR. POLONSKY. It is not rehearsed. When you ask questions and cut me off in the middle of my answer—I don't know. I am willing to talk about anything that—

MR. KEARNEY. You are willing to talk; there is no question about that.

MR. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON. Have you ever been associated with an organization known as the Silver Shirts?

Mr. POLONSKY. I have not.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you ever associated with an organization called the Communist Party?

Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. You make a very fine distinction?

Mr. POLONSKY. That is a very broad distinction.

Mr. JACKSON. There is no distinction at all. You are perfectly willing to crawl under the umbrella of the fifth amendment so far as the Communist Party is concerned but, so long as your toes are not trod upon in the realm of the Communist Party, you have no hesitation in answering questions about the Silver Shirts or fascism or nazism.

Mr. POLONSKY. You draw the implication——

Mr. JACKSON. I am not going to enter into a dialectical discussion with you.

Mr. POLONSKY. Do you know what the Silver Shirts is?

Mr. JACKSON. I do.

Mr. POLONSKY. It is a dirty Fascist organization.

Mr. JACKSON. That is right; it is as dirty on the Fascist side as the Communist Party is on the other side.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Assuming a hypothetical situation, if the United States should be invaded by the Soviet Union, would you bear arms to defend the United States?

Mr. POLONSKY. I have thought very long and deep on that question, because it has been asked many times before this committee. I do not think by committing ourselves to a war we can get peace. I do not think that is the way to get peace.

Mr. POTTER. If Spain should invade the United States under Franco, would you bear arms to defend the United States?

Mr. POLONSKY. I think that goes to the same thing.

Mr. POTTER. You realize many boys today are shouldering arms and dying for their country?

Mr. POLONSKY. Yes; and I am horrified by it. I am horrified by the great debate that is going on in this country. I know what war is, and it is a frightful thing that boys are dying when it doesn't make sense.

Mr. KEARNEY. Don't you think the members of this committee know what war is?

Mr. POLONSKY. Yes; I believe you do know. There is nothing worse than a war.

Mr. POTTER. Did you support our war effort during World War II after the breaking of the Hitler-Stalin Pact?

Mr. POLONSKY. I supported our war effort from the very moment Hitler started the war until we licked them.

Mr. POTTER. You didn't answer the question whether, if Spain under Franco should invade the United States, you then would support our war effort. Please answer that.

Mr. POLONSKY. I didn't refuse to answer that. I said it went to the same kind of reply I made before. I realize this committee is interested in having an answer to it, and they are interested in having an answer to it in terms of a certain concept of loyalty that exists in the committee's mind. I say that, to my way of thinking, the asking of



a question like that at this time is part of a mistaken notion that by committing ourselves to the inevitability of war we will be better prepared to have peace. That doesn't make sense to me.

Mr. WOOD. Is that the only answer you desire to make to the question asked?

Mr. POLONSKY. Yes; it is a question of opinion, and that is my answer.

Mr. WOOD. And the only answer you will give?

Mr. POLONSKY. Yes, sir. I can develop it further if you wish.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed, Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Do you believe as an American citizen you carry with your citizenship a responsibility to defend your country in case of an attack by an aggressor?

Mr. POLONSKY. Isn't that the same question? It just makes it more abstract.

Mr. POTTER. Will you bear arms for your country in case of an attack by an aggressor?

Mr. POLONSKY. I have, in the sense that when I was asked to volunteer they said, "Will you volunteer for a duty that may be dangerous?" I didn't want to, but I did. I didn't know what it was going to be. It turned out not to be dangerous at all in a real sense.

Mr. POTTER. You were very fortunate.

Mr. POLONSKY. I know it, sir.

Mr. POTTER. There have been a lot of men who have been called and who have taken and assumed a responsibility that they have as citizens to bear arms and to risk their necks. They have done it in wars and wars, and they are doing it in Korea today.

Mr. POLONSKY. I didn't serve in a cellar club.

Mr. POTTER. There are many men today being called. If you received orders today to serve in Korea, what would your answer be?

Mr. POLONSKY. I would naturally go. I wouldn't disobey the laws of the United States. But you are asking me a question of opinion or war and peace, and I have answered that.

Mr. POTTER. We all want peace. We have wanted peace for centuries, but we have had wars. In case the war should come, I am asking you, despite the fact you have refused to answer questions concerning a certain ideology, whether you today would support the cause of our country in case we were attacked?

Mr. POLONSKY. I said to you that I would obey the laws of the United States, and I have and will do so in the future. But when you come to the question of war and peace today, that is another question, because that is a question in a sense of fighting for what you believe is correct. I believe if we prepare for war constantly we will surely have it, and the only peace we will have is the peace apes and tigers have.

Mr. POTTER. Peace by domination?

Mr. POLONSKY. There will be no domination after the next war, sir. There will be ruin.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know if any of the Hollywood writers who were convicted and served time in jail are now writing in Hollywood under assumed names or through other parties?

Mr. POLONSKY. Are they all out of jail?

Mr. KEARNEY. Those who are out of jail.



Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Polonsky, when you executed the form that was presented to you, OSS Form 2205, containing the statement that you did not and never had belonged to an organization that advocated the overthrow of this Government, on the day you executed this form did you hold membership then in the Communist Party?

Mr. POLONSKY. I refuse to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. WOOD. Did you know that, under the laws of the United States, any offense you may have committed at that time, saving that involving capital punishment, has been barred by the statute of limitations?

Mr. POLONSKY. I don't know about that.

Mr. WOOD. If your counsel was to advise you that any offense you may have committed, if you did commit any, at the time you signed this form, OSS Form 2205, has been barred by the statute of limitations long since, so that you could not now be prosecuted at all, would you answer the question?

Mr. POLONSKY (after consulting his counsel). I am going to stand on my previous answer to that, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. WOOD. Very well. Any further questions, gentlemen?

Mr. WALTER. In other words, as I understand it, you refuse to answer that question because of the protection you feel you have coming from the fifth amendment to the Constitution?

Mr. POLONSKY. What question, sir?

Mr. WALTER. The last question.

Mr. POLONSKY. Will you repeat the last question?

Mr. WALTER. The question was whether you would refuse to answer if you knew the statute of limitations had run.

Mr. POLONSKY. I don't understand. Excuse me. [After consulting with his counsel.] Which specific question is it you are asking me?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Wood asked you the question whether or not you would decline to answer if you were advised you could not be prosecuted for perjury because the statute of limitations had run.

Mr. POLONSKY. The question was would I decline to answer if certain things went on. Could you put a specific question?

Mr. WALTER. You have declined to answer questions this morning on grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. POLONSKY. Certain questions; yes.

Mr. WALTERS. Didn't you know the fifth amendment relates only to criminal proceedings? This is not a criminal proceeding.

Mr. POLONSKY (after consulting with his counsel). I am informed that the fifth amendment applies to legislative proceedings, and that there have been decisions on this in the last 15 months; and, as I understand, the fifth amendment was mainly for such proceedings.

Mr. WALTER. No. It relates to criminal proceedings.

Mr. POLONSKY. It has been expanded to protect the political rights of Americans. It has to be as wide as possible. And I think this committee is trying to make everybody feel or believe the way they sincerely feel or believe, and is not granting the right to other persons to feel or believe the way they feel or believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to put in evidence OSS Form No. 2205, and suggest it be designated as "Polonsky Exhibit No. 1," and ask leave of the committee to withdraw the original and substitute a photostatic copy thereof.

Mr. WOOD. It will be admitted with that qualification.

(The document above referred to is marked "Polonsky Exhibit No. 1" and filed with the committee.)<sup>1</sup>

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason why this witness should not be excused?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. POLONSKY. I have a statement that I prepared for this meeting, for this inquiry.

Mr. WOOD. Would you like to file it with the committee?

Mr. POLONSKY. I would like to read it if I may.

Mr. WOOD. File it with the committee.

Mr. POLONSKY. Yes, sir. May I say something—just one word?

Mr. TAVENNER. I call Mr. Edward Dmytryk.

Mr. WOOD. Will you raise your right hand, please. You solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF EDWARD DMYTRYK

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Edward Dmytryk.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the spelling is D-m-y-t-r-y-k?

Mr. DMYTRYK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Dmytryk?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I was born in Canada, Grand Forks, British Columbia, September 4, 1908.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you naturalized?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I was naturalized in 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I am a screen director.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now live?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I live in Hollywood at 8338 De Longpre.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you raise your voice, please?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Surely.

Mr. TAVENNER. I wish you would give the committee a brief statement of your educational training.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, I went through grammar school, went through Hollywood High School, and I attended a year the California Institute of Technology before I went back to pictures, where I had worked previously.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you had worked prior to that time in pictures?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes. I left home when I was 14, just when I entered high school, and I worked after school and during vacations at Paramount in order to work my way through school.

<sup>1</sup> Retained in files of the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you earned your way through college by working in the studios?

Mr. DMYTRYK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you work?

Mr. DMYTRYK. At Paramount Studios. I worked in the laboratory as a messenger boy first, and then as a projectionist.

Mr. TAVENNER. What salary did you receive?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I started at \$6 a week.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you outline to the committee what your professional career has been since that time?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes. After I quit college and went back to Hollywood I went to work as a projectionist, which I had been doing for sometime before, after school.

About that time sound came in, in the late twenties, and there was great expansion, and I became assistant cutter then cutter for Paramount until 1939, at which time I got a break directing pictures.

I directed B pictures, three or four at Paramount, at Columbia, one at Universal, and one at RKO. At RKO I made a picture, Hitler's Children, which was a quickie, but it made many millions of dollars, and from then on I directed A pictures, from 1943 until 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were some of the principal productions directed by you?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Behind the Rising Sun; Tender Comrade; Till the End of Time; Back to Bataan; Murder, My Sweet; Cornered; So Well Remembered, which was made in England; and the last picture, Crossfire.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time you directed this picture Crossfire, how did your weekly salary compare with the time you started?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I was making \$2,500 a week, 52 weeks a year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dmytryk, you were subpoenaed as a witness before this committee in 1947?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you are one of those commonly referred to as the "Hollywood Ten"?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. I notice you say you were, rather than are.

Mr. DMYTRYK. I don't think I will be considered so much longer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your testimony today will throw considerable light on that subject?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I imagine so, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you were one of the group who were prosecuted for contempt of Congress, and that you received a sentence, and that you have served that sentence?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I have, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you were subpoenaed before this committee in 1947?

Mr. DMYTRYK. No; I was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes; I had been a member. I had been a member from sometime around the spring or early summer 1944 until about the fall of 1945. Most of this was during the period when the Communist Party as such was dissolved and the Communist Political Association had taken its place.



Mr. TAVENNER. So you had been a member of the party for a comparatively short period of time?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were a member of the so-called "Hollywood Ten," did you have opportunity to further observe the workings of the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I think I can truthfully say that I had much more opportunity to observe the workings of the Communist Party while I was a member of the "Hollywood Ten" than I did while I was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. This committee is endeavoring very strenuously to investigate Communist Party activities and the extent of Communist Party infiltration into the entertainment field, with special reference to the motion picture industry at the present time. Are you willing to cooperate with the committee in giving it the benefit of what knowledge you have from your own experiences, both while a member of the Communist Party and later?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I certainly am.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that is true notwithstanding you refused to testify before this committee in 1947?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes; it is true. The situation has somewhat changed.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by that?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, very simply, this. In 1947—and I think this question is apt to get a little complicated. May I take some time in answering it, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Just treat it as you like.

Mr. DMYTRYK. There is a great deal of difference between 1947 and 1951 as far as the Communist Party is concerned, or at least as far as my awareness of what is going on is concerned.

In 1947 the cold war had not yet gone beyond the freezing point. I wanted to believe that Russia was very sincere in wanting peace, and I didn't feel the Communist Party in this country was any particular menace as far as I knew, and I felt the committee before which I appeared was invading a field they could not properly invade, that is, freedom of speech and freedom of thought; and I also sincerely believed the procedures used by the committee were not completely in keeping with an honest investigation. On those grounds I refused to testify at the time.

Since that time a number of very important developments have taken place. In the first place, I had never heard before 1947 anybody say they would refuse to fight for this country in a war against Soviet Russia. I think I was in England when I first saw an article about an Australian party member who said he would not fight against Soviet Russia. Then I saw articles about American party members taking the same position; I believe Paul Robeson was one. Since then other party members in this country have stated they would not fight for their country. I think in a democracy each person takes upon himself the duty to defend his country in time of war.

Along with other people, I signed the Stockholm Peace Petition. I believe in peace, as everybody does. I hoped they were sincere. However, the Korean War made me realize that they were not. I think any intelligent person must realize that the North Koreans would not have attacked the South Koreans unless they had the backing of very strong forces. I can't prove it, but I believe those forces



are Communist China and Communist Russia. This, too, disturbed me tremendously, and made me realize there is a Communist menace and that the Communist Party in this country is a part of that menace.

The third thing was the spy trials, the development of the Hiss, Coplon, and Greenglass cases, and the Fuchs case in England. To me there is a significant thing about the spy trials. The thing that impressed me was that these people did not get any money, or not much. There are spies who work for their country, and we have respect for them. There are other spies who receive money for their work, and there may be a certain admiration for them, because they risk their necks. These people are doing it for love of the party. This is treason. I think the party that has used them is treasonable also.

I don't say all members of the Communist Party are guilty of treason, but I think a party that encourages them to act in this capacity is treasonable. For this reason I am willing to talk today.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to have you state to this committee, from your own experience in the Communist Party and your study of its activities and what knowledge you have on the subject, what the real object of the Communist Party is in its efforts to organize and infiltrate the moving-picture industry in Hollywood.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, I had no access to inner-party circles, so I can't tell you officially, but my opinion is they had probably three chief purposes.

The first one was to get money. Hollywood is a very wealthy community, and it is a great source of capital.

The next one was to get prestige.

And the third and most important one was, through the infiltration and eventual taking over of Hollywood guilds and unions, to control the content of pictures. The only way they could control the content of pictures was to control studios, and the only way they could do that was to completely take over the guilds and the unions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us go back to the first of those purposes that you mentioned, the matter of money. What information do you have regarding the effort of the Communist Party to obtain sizable sums of money out of its membership in Hollywood?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I have no exact information, but I heard a great deal of talk about it at the time, and I know that at least some of the members were making sizable salaries. This was not true in all cases, but there was in some cases a tithing system under which members gave a percentage of their salaries. Sometimes it amounted to quite a bit of money.

There was also the opportunity to hold a great many affairs—parties, dinners, meetings of various sorts—not so much directly for the Communist Party as for Communist-front organizations, for which they were always able to get very sizable donations, and I think over a period of years, particularly when the love feast was on between Russia and America during the war and for some years afterwards, a great deal of money was taken from Hollywood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make any sizable contribution to the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. No. I wasn't making much at that time. I also had a business manager. A Hollywood business manager is a very unique institution. In order to try to save your money, he gives you a very, very small allowance. I had an allowance of \$25 a week. I sometimes gave \$5 or \$10, but I couldn't give a titling because I would have had to go to my business agent. Business agents are capitalists, and I couldn't ask for money for the Communist Party.

Then, too, I was never indoctrinated enough to know if I would become a serious member of the Communist Party. As it turned out, I didn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. You referred to another purpose of the Communist Party in its work in Hollywood as being the purpose of obtaining prestige. What did you mean by that?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, it did that by getting important names. This, too, is not so much for the party itself. I don't know that the party itself ever recruited any large number of prestige people. However, through what are now called Communist-front organizations, they were able to approach a large percentage, I would say majority, of the name people in Hollywood and get their names on resolutions or as members of boards of the Communist fronts.

This is a complicated thing. When you say Communist front, you get the impression it is run by Communists. This isn't always true. I have seen Communist fronts where there are as few as one or two Communists. Also, there are two kinds of fronts. One kind is organized by the Communist Party itself, or by certain Communists; and another is an organization that starts out as an ordinary liberal organization and is infiltrated by Communists.

The Communists are tireless workers, as I think this committee realizes. Also as I think this committee realizes, one tireless worker in an organization can usually take over that organization in time. A Communist doesn't want to be president. He wants to be secretary. As secretary, he very soon takes control and will run the organization as a Communist organization.

Another important point is that the Communist-front organizations, as such, were never engaged, at least overtly, in any activities that seemed undemocratic or unpatriotic, and that is why they were able to attract so many people. Actually, the work they did during the war was really good work. That is the way they were able to trap so many people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Not so rapid, please.

Mr. DMYTRYK. I will write a note to myself.

I would say that for every Communist in a Communist-front organization in Hollywood, there were 100 non-Communists, and very few of them had any idea they were dominated by a Communist group. This was not because they were fools, but the Communists are clever enough to cover up that fact, and the work they do overtly appeals to many public-minded citizens.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of a third and most important aim and object of the Communist Party as being the purpose of eventually obtaining control of the guilds and unions, as I understood you to say?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What guilds were they that you referred to?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Let me preface that first by saying in the first two points I mentioned, I think the Communists had considerable success in Hollywood. In this last point, they had only limited success.

Hollywood is split up into probably two sections, first the talent guilds: Screen Writers' Guild, unaffiliated; Screen Directors' Guild, unaffiliated; and Screen Actors' Guild, which is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, but is largely autonomous.

Then there are the craft unions, mostly IATSE. I think that is International Association of Theatrical and Stage Employees. I know that the Communists were successful for a time in taking over or largely controlling—they didn't take over but controlled for a long time—the Screen Writers' Guild. They got a number of men on the board to pass their resolutions and that sort of thing. They were not successful at all in the Screen Directors' Guild. There were only a very few Communists in the Screen Directors' Guild at any time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in the Screen Directors' Guild?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes, from 1939 on.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many were there in the Screen Directors' Guild?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I only knew of seven. I recall a special meeting at which they were present.

Mr. WOOD. I don't believe he understood your question.

Mr. TAVENNER. No. I meant the total membership of the Screen Directors' Guild at that time.

Mr. DMYTRYK. The total membership, full directors, was 225 or 230.

Mr. TAVENNER. And of that number there were seven known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. As far as I know there were seven, and as far as I know that was just about all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of the seven?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes. Frank Tuttle.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was a director?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. T-u-t-t-l-e?

Mr. DMYTRYK. T-u-t-t-l-e.

Herbert Biberman, B-i-b-e-r-m-a-n, I believe.

Jack Berry. I don't know whether he spells it B-e-r-r-y or B-a-r-r-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify him further?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I heard the chairman this morning give the address. He is the Berry who lives on Kings Road. The meeting was at his house. That is why I know.

Bernard Vorhaus.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell that?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I believe it is V-o-r-h-a-u-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you have named four.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Then Jules Dassin, D-a-s-s-i-n.

And myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any definite knowledge of any of the others having left the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. No; I don't. I think it is quite possible that some of them have, because that has happened to a large extent in Hollywood in the last few years.



Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say the meeting you described was held at the home of Jack Berry?

Mr. DMYTRYK. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of the meeting?

Mr. DMYTRYK. As far as I can remember, I think it had to do with trying to elect one of us to the board of directors of the Directors' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why was the Communist Party interested at that particular time in placing one of its members on the board of directors of the guild?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, that was part of a very long-term plan. They wanted to get as many people as they could on the board of directors of the guilds so that they could eventually control the policy of those guilds, particularly in relation to an eventual coalition for the backing of the various unions.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, this is one instance in which the Communist Party was endeavoring to obtain control of the guilds, which you have described as one of the principal objects of the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall any other details concerning that meeting?

Mr. DMYTRYK. No; I can't. It is very difficult to recall particular meetings at this time, because most of us were engaged in many meetings, most of them having nothing to do with Communist work, Communist-front work, and so on, and it is difficult at this late date to separate them as to any one meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are definite as to the fact of the seven individuals you have named, including yourself?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. They were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Continuing with your discussion of what you referred to as the third and most important aim or object of the Communist Party, what other efforts do you know of that the Communist Party resorted to, to control either pictures, or the guilds, or the executives of the industry?

Mr. DMYTRYK. The chief effort was in the craft unions. I want to say that in my opinion the Communist Party never had any control over any major executive in any major studio, nor did they at any time have any effective control over the contents of pictures. It is true that somebody may have slipped in a line or something that made them happy, but that is not the kind of thing that would be effective in the least degree, and certainly they never had any control over any major executive that I know of.

But in the craft unions they were successful in organizing a group called the Conference of Studio Unions that did have a great deal to do with the policies. They eventually got so strong that they risked a strike against the IATSE. However, they lost the strike after a very, very long and serious battle, and that attempt came to nothing.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period, did the Communist Party attempt to influence the guilds in the matter of the strike?



Mr. DMYTRYK. I know the three guilds got together and appointed committees to investigate the strike. In almost every case they came out in favor of the Conference of Studio Unions.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were speaking of the craft unions. What do you know about the existence of communism in the craft unions?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, I know very little except that within the Conference of Studio Unions, in particular, they were quite well organized. I also believe that they were actually very few. I don't believe there were over 50 or so in that group. I believe there are people who can tell you more about this than I can. I didn't have much contact with the craft unions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have sufficient contact to be able to tell us what program the Communist Party expected to follow in regard to the craft unions?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I used to hear a good deal of talk about this from other Communists, and the general purpose seemed to be this: That the existing unions, if possible, would be defeated by the CSU or broken up; that the guilds would be kept independent until such time as they thought they could succeed in bringing CIO to Hollywood and affiliating these guilds and independent units with CIO, with the eventual hope that all the craft unions and guilds would be a part of CIO. They seemed to feel that could work more freely within CIO than within AFL.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was before the time CIO expelled various organizations because of their Communist infiltration?

Mr. DMYTRYK. It was, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state what you know about the activity of the Communist Party within the Screen Writers' Guild, if you know?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, I don't know a great deal about that except many of my friends were in the Screen Writers' Guild. The Communists elected enough members to the board directors to control that guild for a large number of years, actually until 1947, I believe. As a result of that, they largely led the fight in Hollywood on various Communist—front activities. They usually led the fight to get the other talent guilds—what we call prestige guilds—they tried to get them to take the side of the CSU against the IATSE. In general, the Screen Writers' Guild led in that kind of work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of your own personal knowledge the names of individuals within that group who were members of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes. I know several. John Howard Lawson was one of them. Lester Cole was a leader in that group. Those are the only two whom I can positively identify as Communists whom I knew as leaders in that group. Gordon Kahn, by the way, was also rather important in the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell his last name?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I believe K-a-h-n. He was editor of the guild publication for a long period of time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you familiar with the activities in the Screen Actors' Guild?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I know practically nothing about any activities within the Screen Actors' Guild. I know that of the three talent

guilds, the Screen Actors' Guild was the most active in leading the fight against communism in Hollywood, and the earliest organization, I believe, to do so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just how did the Communist Party plan to function, or did it function, in its effort to control or to obtain control or influence in these various guilds?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, besides the extent which I have already mentioned, they didn't go beyond that. They didn't get to the point, in my opinion, of ever controlling any kind of content in pictures, which is actually what they were aiming for in the long run.

The Communists for years have realized the importance of any public mediums of propaganda and education. Lenin said way back that the cinema would probably be the most important medium of propaganda and education, and they were trying to take over that medium. They could not walk in and start controlling the content from the beginning. The only way they could control content was through control of the unions and guilds, so that they could get a stranglehold of the executives.

It is very difficult to obtain control, because you have to go through the line, and you would have to have a chain of Communists from beginning to end, five or more, and they never did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know of any instance in which an effort was made to control the content of a picture?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, in a vague way, yes. That is, the attempt to control was vague. I know the instance very well because it happened to me. This is the thing that actually got me out of the party.

In 1945 Adrian Scott and I made a picture called *Cornered*.

The picture was the story of a Canadian pilot immediately after the war who had been married to a French girl who had been in the underground and been killed, and with very little to go on this pilot started looking for the person who had killed her. Many Germans were reported to have escaped to Argentina, and he followed him there, trying to pin him down.

In that picture we had an opportunity to say many things about fascism, which we did. While the first script was being written by John Wexley I found the script had long speeches, propaganda—they were all anti-Nazi and anti-Fascist, but went to extremes in following the party line on the nose. I objected, not because of this, but because the picture was undramatic, too many speeches, and I suggested to Adrian that we get another writer, which we did. We got John Paxton, a very fine writer, who had worked for us previously. And since I have mentioned him, he is not a Communist, by the way. He rewrote the script, we shot it, and made a fairly good melodrama out of it.

After they were making prints to go out to the theaters, so that I knew no changes could be made in it, Adrian Scott received a note from Wexley saying he wanted to have a conference with us. Wexley had had an arbitration on credits and had lost.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by credits?

Mr. DMYTRYK. He wanted a larger share of credit, and there are means of arbitration on writers' disputes about that. They gave Wexley adaptation credit.

The meeting was at my house. I was surprised to see the meeting was of Communists, and the whole meeting was along Communist lines. Adrian Scott and I were attacked by Wexley and by two people he brought with him at the time, Richard Collins and Paul Trivers, T-r-i-v-e-r-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was Paul Trivers' occupation?

Mr. DMYTRYK. He was a writer. I think he is now with the Bob Roberts-John Garfield Co. as a writer.

The whole attack on us was along this line: That by removing Wexley's line we were making a pro-Nazi picture instead of an anti-Nazi picture. To say the least, we were startled.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Adrian Scott a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes; he was. His experience with the party was about the same as mine.

Mr. POTTER. Where did this meeting take place?

Mr. DMYTRYK. At my apartment.

Mr. POTTER. When?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Late summer of 1945 or fall of 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was John Wexley also a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I would say he was a member of the Communist Party because this was unquestionably a Communist Party affair. This was the only time I ever saw him at anything that I considered communistic.

Mr. TAVENNER. Other than John Wexley, how did you know the other persons you mentioned to be members of the Communist Party? Take first Adrian Scott.

Mr. DMYTRYK. I had attended meetings with Scott.

Mr. TAVENNER. Another you mentioned was John Howard Lawson.

Mr. DMYTRYK. No. I mentioned him earlier. I mentioned Collins and Trivers.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you know Trivers to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Only by reputation and by the conduct of this committee hearing. This was a little committee. There was no question then and there is no question now but that this was a Communist meeting, as I will develop later on.

Of course we refused to admit any of the charges made by Wexley and the other two. Nevertheless, they asked for a further meeting. At the further meeting they brought John Howard Lawson, who was the "high lama," of the Communist Party at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why do you say that?

Mr. DMYTRYK. He settled all questions. If there was a switch in the party line, he explained it. If there were any decisions to be made, they went to John Howard Lawson. If there was any conflict within the Communist Party, he was the one who settled it.

We had a third meeting at which Adrian Scott brought in Albert Maltz, who was a more liberal Communist, to defend us. These meetings ended in a stalemate.

There were several byproducts of these meetings. I think Albert Maltz had been concerned with the lack of freedom of thought in the Communist Party for some time, and this was the trigger for the



article he wrote for the New Masses on freedom of thought which was so widely discussed.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is your view that this incident you have described had a very strong effect upon Albert Maltz?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I know unquestionably it did, because I talked to him about it, and he was very much concerned with this effort to control the thought of members. So he wrote the article which he later had to repudiate or get out of the party, and he chose to repudiate it.

Adrian Scott was also concerned, and he thought we should have a meeting with John Howard Lawson and discuss the broad subject with him. We had luncheon with John Howard Lawson at the Gotham Cafe in Hollywood. It was a very unsatisfactory meeting. John Howard Lawson was very uncommunicative; he would not explain his actions, would give no reason for them. He said we obviously showed we could not accept party discipline, and if we felt that way it would probably be better that we get out of the party.

We made no official decision at that time. Adrian Scott was loath to make any decision. I never attended any meeting after that. So although that was not an official getting out of the party—very few write letters of resignation or anything of that kind—I never attended any other meeting of the Communist Party as such.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you anything further to say regarding the point three that you mentioned, as to the most important of the aims and purposes of the Communist Party in Hollywood?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I don't believe there is anything more I can say except to say that in Hollywood they have failed. I feel sure that the Communist Party is now a completely ineffective element in Hollywood life.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have been rather struck with some of the testimony here as to the station in life and the measure of success that various people apparently had when they became members of the Communist Party. What appeal was there in the Communist Party which aided them in recruiting members? How was it that individuals—for instance, such as Jarrico, as to whom there has been testimony that he was a member of the Communist Party—how was it they would become members?

Mr. DMYTRYK. The answer to that question is rather involved, again. However, I would like to talk about it a little bit, because I think there are many misapprehensions about the type of people who become Communists. This is particularly true of Hollywood.

Writers are, of course, traditionally concerned with people. These are the bones of their work. To understand people properly they have to understand the society in which they live and the economic conditions under which they live. So any writer worthy of the name studies these problems. Probably he becomes a writer because he is a humanitarian. There is at least a streak of altruism and idealism in him. So they usually come in contact with Communists more than the average person. Most of these people do not come from poor backgrounds of poverty and deprivation. Most of them come from good backgrounds. They become troubled about poverty, especially where there is such a discrepancy, where a man making \$2,500 a week is working next to a man making \$25 a week. They consider this unfair. It is a characteristic purely of Hollywood.



You hear in Hollywood more than anywhere else the word "break" used. If you ask a successful person in Hollywood how he got there, he will never say, "I got here by hard work and personality." He will say, "I got the breaks." Of course, hard work and personality count a great deal, but "breaks" count too.

When I was a projectionist the head of the cutting department came to me and an older man who was also a projectionist and gave both of us an opportunity to become a cutter. The older man wouldn't take it. He wanted security, and preferred to remain as a projectionist. I took it. He is still a projectionist, and I am a high-salaried director. I took the chance.

We think, "There but for the grace of God go I" when we see somebody not so successful.

As a result, a person in Hollywood is really interested in bringing up the general level of people around him. He knows he can't do it individually. He knows it wouldn't do any good to give five bucks here or there. He looks around for some organization in which he can work that does these things. He finds Marxism because it is waiting for him.

Of course, it is not that simple. He doesn't just open his eyes and see Marxism and say, "That is for me." The Communist Party has laid very clever fly traps for him. These organizations are all around him. And most of the work they do is very good. Their overt purpose is certainly good. They may eventually be used for other purposes.

These organizations are not for the long-term work of the Communist Party. They are used to attract many people. They not only attract those who become Communists, but they attract many who never become Communists but who give the Communists the advantage of their time, their work, and their money.

The average man who joins the party, I think Koestler said 7 out of every 10 who joined the party got out. The phrase has been used that the same ideals that took them in the party took them out again.

The average person who goes in finds there is no freedom of thought; that the discipline is a very harsh one.

If it had not been for my experience in connection with *Cornered*, I might have gone on for some time before I would have dropped out of the party. The party has a very good explanation for everything that troubles a man. If he says he doesn't have freedom, the great explainer, whoever he is in that locality, will point out that he has freedom to tell the truth; that the Communist Party has discovered the ultimate truth, and within that limit he can speak. Anything outside of the party line is a lie. Of course, anything capitalistic is basically a lie because it comes from a system they consider dishonest to begin with.

So when a man accepts this thing he believes he is following the truth. When a man leaves, like Albert Maltz, he is brought back in line or thrown out. Many go out.

Something else takes place. You are isolated. You are surrounded by people who believe as you do. The people talk a lot, but they all agree with each other. You go to a party or to a friend's house, and you simply make statements and agree with each other, and of course damn the capitalists. You become isolated so much that after a while

you don't know what the truth is, and it takes some shocking event to get you out of it.

The Communists very effectively use these organizations, and they are primarily for the purpose of getting well-intentioned people in the organizations. You see, many Communist Party members, I would say the majority of members are not used in subversive activities. They are concerned with the organization and running of the Communist fronts and things of that kind, and many of them can go to their deaths believing they were working in a decent organization, if they don't look on the outside to see what is happening in Russia.

It is the "end" policy of the Communist Party which explains everything. Whatever is done, they say, "This had to be done to achieve a good end." The end overtly is Utopia.

For instance, many people questioned the Communist purges. The answer was, "These people are revolutionists. We must hold them back."

The same thing is true of the Hitler-Stalin Pact and the Finnish War. The Hitler-Stalin Pact was to achieve a good end. The Finnish War, they explained if they didn't have all that span between Finland and Leningrad, Leningrad would have been overrun.

My wife had an interesting experience while I was in jail. My wife is not political at all, but she wanted me to get home very badly and was doing what she could, together with other wives of the "ten," to get me home.

She was called and asked to go with one of the wives of the "ten" to Sacramento, where all three parties—Democratic, Republican, and Progressive—were holding conventions. My wife noticed that the wife, or the woman, she was with, and others she had made contact with up there, were doing things that she didn't think were quite proper. For instance, they were getting information. In one particular instance they asked a small clerk, getting a small salary, to give them a secret list. My wife said, "You are asking him to risk his livelihood. He might lose his job and his reputation." The answer was, "It doesn't matter if one person gets hurt if thousands will eventually benefit."

That answer is a very corrupt thing. You cannot get a perfect end by using a corrupt means, because the corrupt means corrupts you so that you don't know what a perfect end is.

Mr. WALTER. How do the Communists explain the 18,000,000 slave laborers in Russia?

Mr. DMYTRYK. In this country they deny it. They say the capitalist press does not print the truth, that they print only lies. I have had arguments on that. I have said I didn't believe all they printed were lies. They will admit some people are liquidated, but they say it is for the good of humanity. You can make people believe this very easily.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have described the general method used by the Communist Party in making its appeal to persons in Hollywood. I wish you would tell us now the circumstances of your own joining of the Communist Party, when it was and how it occurred.

Mr. DMYTRYK. I joined, as I said before, in 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me a moment. Prior to that time were you a member of various Communist-front organizations?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes. That is the way I got into the party. Probably as early as 1942 I had begun to be interested in what later became, although I didn't know it at the time, Communist fronts. I knew it before I joined the party, however.

There was a school started that eventually became the People's Educational Center. Before that it was a small school, and there was one class for readers, and they wanted me to come and give them a talk on cutting, the editing of pictures, which I did.

Most crafts in Hollywood are learned pragmatically. There are no texts telling you how to write a play, or how to cut. Everything I had learned about cutting I had learned from experience.

In preparing a lecture I had to try to arrive at certain theories of cutting, and in doing this I found I was finding out things about my profession—which I still did on my own pictures—which I had never learned before. I was very excited about that. I was asked to repeat the lecture, which I did, and improved on it.

About this time, in 1943, the People's Educational Center was organized, and one of the classes was a class in screen direction. It was actually an orientation course. We had 12 lectures by directors—how a screen play is directed, technicolor, cutting, and so forth. I became one of the lecturers. Some of the lecturers were Communists, but most of them were not, and most of the students were not Communists, and I personally never heard of any Communist Party line followed; certainly not in our class.

I lectured there also on related subjects having to do with screen direction, and I liked it very much.

Then I learned the Communists were running this organization. It was during the war, and I didn't say, "How horrible." I said, "The Communists are doing something I think is good."

The Writers' Congress was held about 1943. This was a meeting of writers from all over the country and from foreign countries. We had quite a few refugees in this country at that time. A message from President Roosevelt was read at the congress. Gordon Sproul was honorary chairman. I think Daryl Zanuck was in it.

I later found that some of the people connected with the Congress were Communists. This was a good thing. I thought one of the things we needed was a meeting of cultural minds. I attended several of the seminars and found them very good. They were all concerned with the craft and with various related artistic endeavors.

When I found out this, too, had been organized by Communists, I thought it showed the Communist Party was engaged in good things.

The Writers' Mobilization was formed about this time. The Writers' Mobilization, Emmett Lavery testified in 1947, got a medal for work they did for the war effort. They were writing speeches for patriotic organizations, writing scripts for USO, and that sort of thing. This, too, I found out had been very largely organized by a few Communists. I was active in that a while. I was interested in that, too. I did not know too much about it because I was not a writer, but I did chair a seminar on the Nature of the Enemy.

Also during this time I had made acquaintances and shown interest in these activities, so I was approached by people—I can't say by whom—to join the Communist Party. I was curious. I had tried to read Marx, but never got beyond the first chapter. So I agreed



to go to a recruiting meeting, and eventually I went to a Communist Party meeting. Immediately after that the Communist Party was dissolved as such and became the Communist Political Association.

At this time the line was that communism can work with capitalism because capitalism is now enlightened; there is no need for revolution, and no need for conflict.

Mr. TAVENNER. That doctrine was very short-lived?

Mr. DMYTRYK. About a year, I think. Browder got kicked out for it.

Also, during this time there was a good deal of disorganization in Hollywood. I attended only about six or seven regular group meetings and perhaps three special group meetings in all the time I was in the party.

Mr. POTTER. Who asked you to attend the first recruiting meeting?

Mr. DMYTRYK. The man who spoke at this meeting was Alvah Bessie, later one of the "Hollywood Ten."

Mr. TAVENNER. Alvah Bessie?

Mr. DMYTRYK. A-l-v-a-h B-e-s-s-i-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were some of the others in that group with you?

Mr. DMYTRYK. At that recruiting meeting, which was held at Frank Tuttle's house, although he was not there, the only one I knew was Alvah Bessie, because he spoke. That was not a regular Communist meeting. Later I went with a friend of mine—I won't mention his name because he has since died—I went to a meeting in San Fernando Valley at which I signed a Communist Party card.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that a cell?

Mr. DMYTRYK. We didn't call them cells. This was a neighborhood group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give the names of people with you in that group?

Mr. DMYTRYK. One was Lester Cole. Another was a man named Sackin, S-a-c-k-i-n. I had known him in the picture business. I think his first name was Lou or Moe, L-o-u or M-o-e. I think there are two of them. I cannot positively identify him.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean there are two separate people?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes. The others I didn't know. There is a reason for that. When you first come to a Communist Party meeting you are not introduced by your last name, nor are the others introduced to you by their last names, so unless you happen to know them, you don't know who they are for a long time. I went to only a couple of these meetings. Later I moved to Beverly Hills, and went to a couple of meetings there, and then moved to another group, so I never got to know any of these people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Describe each of these groups to which you were assigned.

Mr. DMYTRYK. The second group I was assigned to met in Hollywood. In this group I saw Herbert Biberman; Arnold Manoff, M-a-n-o-f-f; Mickey Uris, U-r-i-s; and Leonardo Bercovici.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the spelling of that last name?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I think it is B-e-r-c-o-v-i-c-i. It is lucky I am Slavic or I couldn't spell those names.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there others in that group that you can recall?



Mr. DMYTRYK. Offhand they are the only ones I can recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you were transferred to another group?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I was transferred to a special group. This was toward the end of the Communist Political Association. I don't know exactly why this special group was organized. I was told later—I believe I heard it at the original hearings—they were called the Davis group.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you heard it was called the Davis group?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes. They started naming the groups after famous dead Communists. They wouldn't use live ones because they didn't know how they would wind up. That group met in San Fernando Valley. They were people either considered supersecret or superprestige. I attended two meetings. I have no idea what the ultimate purpose of the group was, but I know it was a secret thing. I attended two meetings of this group. One meeting was at Sidney Buchman's house, although Sidney Buchman was not present at the meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the circumstances under which you met at his house?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I can't say exactly, except Adrian Scott had been called and told to bring me along and come to a certain person's house. We went there and found no one there, and a servant told us to go to Sidney Buchman's house, and we did. Sidney Buchman was not there.

In this group were John Howard Lawson; Adrian Scott and myself; a writer named Francis—this is the masculine Francis—Faragoh, F-a-r-a-g-o-h, and his wife, Elizabeth Faragoh; and a couple I had never met before; the man's name, I believe, is George Corey, a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. C-o-r-e-y?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes; and his wife; I don't know her first name, Mrs. Corey, who was an advertising executive with a downtown store in Los Angeles. She had nothing to do with the motion-picture business.

Mr. Wood. The committee will recess until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

(Thereupon, at 12:30 p. m., a recess was taken until 3 p. m. of the same day.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

(The committee reconvened at 3 p. m., pursuant to adjournment.)

Mr. Wood. Let the record show the following committee members are present: Walter, Frazier, Wood, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Potter. A quorum is present.

You may proceed, Mr. Counsel.

#### TESTIMONY OF EDWARD DMYTRYK—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dmytryk, you were at the time of taking the recess telling us those who were members of the special cell to which you were transferred, or special group. I believe you probably named all whom you can recall, but I want to be certain about that.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes. There were no other members in that group, at least who ever attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. The list you gave comprised all who were members of that particular group?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I happen to know them all, and that was the group; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, during the course of the period of time when you were a member of these various groups did you at any time attend a fraction meeting of the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes. I don't know whether that is the proper term, because I honestly don't know what term they use, but I attended at least three special meetings, that is, meetings composed of perhaps different people where particular subjects were taken up. One I have already taken up, the directors group.

Now, there was another group at Paul Trivers' house. I can't remember who was present there. I haven't even the faintest recollection of what it was all about, and the only one I can identify at that particular meeting is Paul Trivers.

Then there was another group, which met for the purpose, I think, of some sort of affair that had to do with the fight against anti-Negro prejudice. That was composed of small committees, as it were, from several cells, several groups, rather neighborhood groups throughout the town. Most of them I didn't know. I knew just a few from Hollywood. The meeting was held at Ben Margolis' house, and Mr. Margolis was present, and Henry Blankfort was present. B-l-a-n-k-f-o-r-t I believe is the way that is spelled. And a man named George Pepper—P-e-p-p-e-r.

Now, also at one or another of these groups—it may have been at this one and may not—there were a couple of men. Sam Moore from Radio was present, and Maurice Clark, about whom I know nothing except he was concerned with the Peoples Educational Center.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what was his name?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Maurice Clark.

Mr. TAVENNER. Clark—C-l-a-r-k?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I believe so.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the first name M-a-u-r-i-c-e?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I believe so; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. This first meeting that you described was at the home of Ben Margolis?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, he was at this time. This was definitely a Communist Party meeting.

Mr. WALTER. What is Mr. Margolis' occupation?

Mr. DMYTRYK. He is an attorney.

Mr. WALTER. Is he the man who has appeared here on several occasions with witnesses?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I believe so. He appeared with us back in 1947.

Mr. WALTER. Perhaps that accounts for the reluctance on the part of some of the witnesses to testify.

Mr. DMYTRYK. It is possible.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now that that question has been asked, let me refer you to a statement you made in the earlier part of the testimony. I understood you to say that you had learned a good deal about communism through your associations with the group known as the Hollywood Ten. Didn't you make a statement to that effect?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes; I did. I said that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you have reference to?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, simply this: That after the hearings here in 1947 when we went back to Hollywood we organized. We had—it couldn't be called an organization, but a group who shared lawyers. called the Nineteen. Of these, 10 appeared before the committee and were cited for contempt, and so we organized the Hollywood Ten in Hollywood for the sharing of expenses, because we were all pretty broke by that time. We had to pay our attorneys. We conducted certain public-relations campaigns, not very successfully, but we did—that took a good deal of money. We had to hold affairs to collect money from private people and at functions, dinners, and that sort of thing. And we held meetings quite frequently in order to discuss the various problems that came up.

Right after the hearings in 1947 a number of speeches were made at various places. We were hot copy then, and, as a matter of fact, I think I made a couple of speeches myself. However, not being a very good speaker, I didn't continue speaking.

Now, I left the country shortly after that. I couldn't work in Hollywood. We were all fired, those of us who were under contract by the studios, 5 out of the 10. I went to England to make a couple of pictures there. I made two pictures while I was there. I was there all together for a period of about 18 months, roughly. In other words, I went there early in 1948, and I came back in 1949, at the time when it was assumed that our case would get up in the Supreme Court, and there would be some decision made, and we would either go to jail or not go to jail.

I had to be back in the country. However, quite a bit of time intervened before the Supreme Court actually handed down its decision, so I really became more active then. I had been away from it in England for awhile. My friends in England were comparatively conservative people. Some were Socialists. I don't know of any Communists in the group.

One thing happened in England, however, that might be of interest. That is, Kravchenko, who had written a book——

Mr. TAVENNER. Victor Kravchenko?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes. Had written a book exposing Russian communism, I believe. I never read the book. I am not sure. Anyway, a Communist newspaper—I don't know the name of it—in Paris printed the story about it, said that it was composed of lies. He sued the paper for libel. While I was in England a subpoena was sent over to England from France for me to appear at the trial. I was called and asked to accept a subpoena. I didn't then. I tried to find out what they wanted me for, and I found out they wanted me to come and testify.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who wanted you?

Mr. DMYTRYK. The newspaper side. In other words, the Communist side in this case wanted me to come over and testify in the light of my experiences in the United States that there was a great deal of repression and persecution in the United States. This didn't seem to me to have any bearing on whether or not Kravchenko had been libeled, and, besides, I think no man, even if he feels a grievance, should wash his dirty linen in public in a foreign country.

Anyway, I was asked three different times to accept the subpoena, and I refused, and they finally stopped calling me.



Now, when I came back to this country, as I say, we had a great many meetings then of the Hollywood Ten. We used to meet almost regularly at least every week. There were special committees. And during this time I, too, having been away for so long particularly, I attended all the meetings. I got into discussions. I got into arguments. I noticed that a change had taken place in the time while I was gone, and that the group was, without question, following the party line all the way down the line.

I know the basis of my arguments was primarily that I thought that since we were conducting a fight on civil liberties that we ought to include as many people in our fight as we could, liberals, middle-of-the-roaders, progressives, everybody, and that the only way we could do this was make an honest fight on an honest issue.

However, the group usually voted to support every cause they could. That is, they put stuff out in defense of the New York 11, the Communists in New York, the Harry Bridges case, every case of this sort that came up. As I say, it was a typical Communist front at this time, and a great deal of this—we used to have discussions in our groups. Sometimes others would agree with me on my point of view. Sometimes they would initiate this kind of point, but I noticed that when it really got down, when the argument got hot, that somebody would call on John Howard Lawson, and then eventually on Ben Margolis, and the dialectical reasoning would come, and in effect, the party line dictate would come.

I am convinced now—although I can't prove it—I am convinced at least a small group of these people probably used to meet before the meetings and lay out the agenda. I know this is a common practice in the other meetings I have taken part in. It probably happened at our Hollywood Ten meetings, too. In the long run it would wind up always, of course, in favor of the broad Communist Party line of action.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the early period—I might say about the time you were subpoenaed to appear before this committee, was there any indication to you that the Communist Party was endeavoring in any way to influence the course of action that you as a group should take when you appeared here before this committee?

Mr. DMYTRYK. You mean the first time?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, I certainly had no idea of it at the time. In looking back, of course, I can reach conclusions based on my later experiences about that, which I couldn't have had at the time. I think in looking back on it and remembering how the 19 were organized, I would say the answer to that would probably be "Yes."

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, describe that to the committee.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, it went something like this. When we first got the subpoenas, Adrian Scott and I accepted subpoenas from the marshal at RKO studios. We had been in touch with nobody else, nor did we get in touch with anybody else at that time. We decided we wanted to get a lawyer.

So I think that Adrian Scott at that time on a story, Behind the Silken Curtain, had had some contact with Bartley Crum, whom we knew as a liberal Republican from San Francisco, a man who had been very active in Willkie's campaign. So we decided to contact Bartley Crum and ask him to serve as our counsel.



We went to San Francisco and talked to him. He agreed. We told him our experience, that we had been members of the party. We had both gotten out. We asked him to serve as our counsel.

Now, we came back to Hollywood, and we were asked to attend a very loose meeting of a group of the people who had gotten subpoenas, other people who had gotten subpoenas and who were not friendly to the committee.

This meeting was held at Edward G. Robinson's house. He was not there. As a matter of fact, he wasn't even in town at the time. The only reason it was held there—I want to make this very clear—is that Senator Pepper was visiting in Hollywood at the time, and whether he was a house guest with the Robinsons—I know he was quite friendly. They thought it would be wise if we could get together with Senator Pepper and just find out from him what the situation was in Washington, what the feeling was, which we did. He spoke, extemporaneously of course, very informally, completely harmlessly. He simply tried to give us a picture of people in Washington, what was going on in Washington, in a very broad sort of way. There was nothing there you could pick on in any way at all.

At the end of that meeting, however, we were approached by people like Herbert Biberman, Adrian Scott, and asked to attend a further meeting, at which we would discuss procedure for our mutual benefit. We had another meeting. We had several after that, and found out that these other people had obtained other attorneys, Ben Margolis, Charley Katz, and Bob Kenny. Now, different ones had gone to different attorneys. Not all had gone to these three.

So we finally decided that since the expenses would be heavy and since there were quite a few members of that group who hadn't worked for a long time and had no money and that we would, in effect, have to carry them, support them, that we should all get together and pool our attorneys, pool our resources, as it were, primarily at first for financial reasons.

As I say, looking back at it now, I would assume that the thing was probably fairly carefully planned by a certain number, but we went into it with our eyes wide open, not realizing exactly what was going on at the time. There is no excuse that can be made for that.

We came back to Washington and worked as a unit, not in discussing what our testimony would or wouldn't be, so much as, as I say, on financial questions, on broad political questions, and that sort of thing. We used to hold meetings. We were at the Shoreham Hotel part of the time, at least some of them. We had a large suite there, used to hold meetings regularly every day and discuss the various problems that came up of our mutual interest.

MR. TAVENNER. Did any persons appear before your meeting to discuss—other than your counsel—to discuss matters in which the group as a whole were interested?

MR. DMYTRYK. We had various visitors, yes; at different times, two of whom I can remember. One was Lee Pressman, who delivered a little informal speech.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the subject of his speech?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Simply we were in the forefront of a battle for freedom, and we were on the barricades, and—you know, he wished us luck and success, that we stick to our guns and fight.

The other person was Harry Bridges. I don't think he made any speech, but he talked just to—several of these people were his friends.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you gain the impression that your group was being encouraged by Lee Pressman and Harry Bridges in the stand that it was taking?

Mr. DMYTRYK. There was no question about that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, the result of your concerted agreement and action was you would refuse to testify when appearing before the committee; is that correct?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes. It was generally agreed. We were fighting it, as I say—at least this was the only thing we ever talked about; what was in people's minds I can't testify—but we were fighting it purely on the standpoint of civil liberties and the first amendment. The principle was that since we believed the procedures of the committee at that time were not proper, the only way to test it was to take them into court or have them take us into court, which is literally what happened, on a constitutional issue. This is a practice, you know, that is frequently resorted to, as you know, and of course the only way we could do that was to stand on certain constitutional grounds.

We were sure, because we knew from previous experiences of other groups, that we would be cited for contempt, and we hoped and sincerely believed at the time that on the question of the first amendment we could get at least a Supreme Court decision in our favor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, was there an agreement by all to resort to that general procedure of refusing to testify, or was there difference of opinion, which only after some time was resolved?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I don't think there was any real difference of opinion. We were very careful not to discuss this in the group. We felt there was some danger that this might constitute conspiracy, and most of the decisions were made—I mean the decisions on how to act before the committee—were made by individual consultation with the attorneys.

Now, the attorneys gave the same advice to everybody. There was disagreement at first to some extent among the attorneys. That didn't always run smoothly. In general I would say that Bob Kenny and Bartley Crum were on the more conservative side, but they were outvoted, and I frankly don't know how strong they were in their private conversations. I am sure Bartley Crum disapproved of the tactics pretty much, but he went along with them. There were other elements that led us to believe that the tactics might be successful.

In brief, for awhile the motion picture industry as such—that is, their spokesmen—fought the committee, too. We were led to believe they would support us. Actually they didn't. So that we had many reasons to think that we were following the right course at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you spoke of the industry encouraging you in the matter, what do you mean?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, I mean this: There had been several hearings into the industry by this committee at that time, and before that, and I think by a senatorial committee. I don't remember exactly which one. I do remember, however, Wendell Willkie defended the

committee—I mean Hollywood—at that time. That is, he was the counsel for the committee—for Hollywood, rather. And there was fear in Hollywood pretty generally among most of the people that the committee was really out to try, for perhaps publicity reasons, for I don't know what, to try to intimidate Hollywood, to try to make capital out of the thing. So many of the executives in Hollywood were not in favor, either, of the committee and were anxious—some of them were anxious to get subpoenas and testify before the committee to defend Hollywood. And it was our general understanding at first—although I cannot say they specifically ever approved of the way we chose to fight the committee—that the fact that we were not being friendly witnesses but were in effect fighting the committee was a good thing for Hollywood. As I say, I can't say they approved of our tactics. I rather imagine that they didn't—of our specific tactics.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned the fact that a meeting was held at the home of Edward G. Robinson. Do you have any knowledge of Communist Party membership or activity by Edward G. Robinson?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I have not. To the best of my knowledge, he was never a Communist. I can only say this because I used to hear, of course, talk about various personalities from Communist Party members whom I knew, and I don't think anybody ever considered him a Communist. It is true that he gave some money to Communist-front organizations, as they were later known, but many people did this without knowing what they were doing. I don't think, however, that he ever gave any money to the Hollywood Ten. I remember there was some resentment of this, and for that reason I am pretty sure. The general feeling among our group toward Robinson was one of rather mild resentment.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have a list here of about 24 individuals whom you have named as being known to you to be members of the Communist Party, and whose names you have given in the course of your testimony. I want to ask you about one of those to make certain what your testimony was. You mentioned the name of Alvah Bessie.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that a meeting was held in his home

Mr. DMYTRYK. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that incorrect?

Mr. DMYTRYK. That is incorrect. I mentioned a meeting was held, a kind of recruiting meeting was held at Frank Tuttle's home, at which time Alvah Bessie spoke about the party. He had fought in the International Brigade in Spain and was a bit of a heroic figure at that time, and he was used in this way. In other words, what he said had weight with people who had been in favor of the Republican forces in Spain. And he spoke at that party to recruit me and anybody else who was there who was recruitable.

Mr. TAVENNER. Recruit you into what?

Mr. DMYTRYK. In the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know Richard Collins to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Only through his participation in that hearing—arbitration, let's say—on *Cornered*. I believe now from certain things that I know that Collins at that time, although he was still a member of the party, was in the process of gradually disassociating himself



from the group. However, he was present at this particular thing, and this is my only knowledge of Collins as a Communist.

You see, it is one thing to believe or know casually that a number of people are Communists, but it is another thing to be able to say definitely they are party members unless I have seen them at a meeting of some kind. I couldn't testify to that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you sit in a Communist Party meeting at any time with Richard Collins?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Only in this particular affair. I might comment—I would like to comment here on this particular thing. A person can be in the Communist Party for a long time, much longer than I was, and still not know definitely, positively, that many people are Communists, because these groups are kept fairly separate. And unless a man moves around a great deal and gets in different neighborhood groups he doesn't know the members of another group. It is possible for him to work alongside another Communist, to know by his attitude and by the remarks he makes and how he talks that he is a Communist, and yet not ever know positively. There is no secret handshake or password, and I have never heard anybody come up to me and say, "I am a Communist." It just doesn't happen. And you can suspect 50 people or 100 people, but you cannot be sure unless you have worked with them in a meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, for instance, Richard Collins, to give an example of what you are speaking of, testified that he had been a member of the Communist Party in Hollywood for around 9 years; that he attended meetings about twice a week—an average of twice a week during all of that period. And yet you never sat in a meeting with him.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Never sat in a meeting with him outside of the incident I mentioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sterling Hayden was one who testified that he had attended a number of meetings. Did you ever sit in a meeting with him?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I was very surprised when I heard he was a Communist—when he admitted being a member of the Communist Party. I had no idea he was even close.

Mr. TAVENNER. Larry Parks has testified he was a member of the Communist Party and attended meetings. Did you ever attend a meeting at which he was present?

Mr. DMYTRYK. No. As a matter of fact, at the time of the original hearings I personally was convinced Larry Parks was one of those—and there were several in the 19—who was not a Communist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Meta Rosenberg testified as to the attendance at a number of meetings. Did you ever attend a meeting with her?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I never did.

Mr. TAVENNER. The 24 persons you have named are persons known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were a member, I believe, of the Council of the Hollywood Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes. Actually at two different periods, one an early period—I can't remember exactly when, way back in the middle 1940's, I believe—I was on the board. I actually attended, I believe, only one meeting at that time, although I may have taken part in



activities of theirs. I really can't remember that. Later when I came back from Europe, actually as a member of the ten I again was placed on the board. Again I attended only one meeting. They actually always elected a great many people on the board, knowing only a few could attend as a rule. I had other things to do, and I only attended one. The reason for my being on the board was about that time—that is, around, I should say, the middle of 1949, at the latest—the Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions took the case of the Hollywood ten as their leading cause; that this was the thing they were really going to fight for.

I want to explain a little bit about the Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions. It is unquestionably what could be called a Communist front. However, without question, also, the majority of people who belong to it are not Communists. This is true in Hollywood, and I think this is largely true throughout the rest of the country. Nevertheless, I think at one time I know that the secretary of it, a man I mentioned, George Pepper—he was secretary of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, and in general I think it can be said to have been run by Communists.

MR. TAVENNER. Was it affiliated with the Progressive Citizens of America?

MR. DMYTRYK. I believe so.

MR. TAVENNER. When the Progressive Citizens of America dissolved into the Wallace Progressive Party movement in 1948, do you know what effect that had upon the Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions? What happened to it?

MR. DMYTRYK. I would say that the Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions was one of the Progressive Party's chief supporters, because I know they ran affairs to collect money for the Progressive Party for the Wallace movement. That at that time was their chief job.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, you have described to us in great detail the experience you have had in connection with the picture *Cornered* when you were told at the conclusion of that incident by Howard Lawson that if you could not accept the discipline of the Communist Party, probably the best thing for you and Scott to do was to get out.

MR. DMYTRYK. Yes.

MR. TAVENNER. I understood you to say that that incident had a lot to do with your determining that you would get out of the party.

MR. DMYTRYK. Yes; it did.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, explain that more in detail.

MR. DMYTRYK. Well, it is simply this: That I had always believed in the right of every individual to think as he wished, and particularly for every artist to be perfectly free in what he had to say. I had never gone along even during the period I was a member of the Communist Political Association and Party with any kind of thought control, and before that actually I had never myself experienced any such instances. The fact that they tried to tell us what to do, that others got together and tried to tell us what to do, shocked me very deeply. I knew myself that I could never submit to that kind of discipline.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, in that connection there has come to our attention an incident of a similar circumstance that came over the radio

today. One of our staff members heard it, and a few moments ago we were able to locate it in the newspaper. I am going to read it to you:

[Washington Daily News, April 25, 1951, p. 7.]

#### SOVIET OPERA FAILS AT COLLECTIVE FARMING

The Russian Government has fired the director of its state-owned Bolshoi Theater for staging an opera which failed to show the best qualities of Soviet farmers. A brief radio Moscow announcement yesterday said A. V. Solodovnikov had been replaced as theater director by A. I. Anisimov for unsatisfactory direction. But Pravda provided some details a week ago. It said Herman Zhukovsky's opera, *From All Our Hearts*, failed to reflect the riches and joyfulness of life on a collective farm. Authors, composers, and stage designers were jolted by the Pravda blast, because the opera had received a Stalin prize only last month. Furthermore, Stalin had attended the opera shortly after. Pravda even assailed the All-Union Committee of Fine Arts, final authority on new artistic works, for permitting the production of an unhealthy, inartistic opera.

That was based upon the failure of this play to properly describe the best qualities of collective farming. Now, is that the type of discipline to which you refer in a general way as being objectionable and as being accepted in the Communist Party?

MR. DMYTRYK. It certainly is, and I think without question if the Communist Party ever got even control of the motion-picture medium the same kind of censorship would have taken place. As a matter of fact, I have discussed this kind of problem with Communists before. For instance, the famous case of the Communist musicians who were reprimanded by the party—and I remember asking, "How can anybody, any commissar or committee say what is people's music? It doesn't make sense to me, because a note doesn't propagandize as far as I am concerned." But they said, "No. If you really study it very carefully there is a great deal to this. There is a certain kind of music people understand. If they understand it, it is people's music, and it should be done. On the other hand, if the music isn't understood by the people, then it is counterrevolutionary and as such should be forbidden." I have had these arguments specifically with Communists in Hollywood.

MR. TAVENNER. And was that argument equally valid with regard to the Duclos letter, which has been mentioned here in the testimony a number of times?

MR. DMYTRYK. The Duclos letter was a little bit different. I'd say this was what happened. Browder recently, and his associates, decided they could cooperate with the capitalistic government, that revolution or war was not necessary, that the capitalist form itself would eventually evolve into a Socialist form of government. Now, after the war was over and there was no longer need on the part of Russia to cooperate with the United States, Duclos, who was a French Communist, a powerful worker in the French underground, went to Russia. When he came back to Paris he wrote his famous letter, and I think it was a letter to a newspaper, in which he criticized severely the American party line as it had been followed under the Communist Political Association.

Now, this is a technique that is often employed. In other words, the Russians, in order to avoid any charge that they are directing outside Communist parties, will let an Italian Communist make—this is supposed to be purely a criticism. The fact that it isn't I think is clearly

demonstrated by the fact that Duclos' letter came out, and there was a tremendous crisis in the American Communist group. Browder and his supporters were thrown out of the party, and the strong Communist Party line people were put into control.

This even had some repercussions in Hollywood, because John Howard Lawson, who had been a Browder supporter and who had been a strong preacher of the cooperative policy, immediately, of course, was in trouble, too, and he had to do a lot of very fast tight-rope walking in order to save himself. A lot of the Communists in Hollywood were a little bit happy about this, because even they had resented the Lawson touch, the fact that he was the final answer to everything. And so they hoped he would get thrown out, too, but he made his peace with the new group and was back in his original position in not too much time.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, do any other instances occur to you which would indicate a strong party discipline within the Communist Party?

MR. DMYTRYK. Just offhand I can't.

MR. TAVENNER. Of course, the reversal of Albert Maltz in his letter was one which you have mentioned.

MR. DMYTRYK. Yes; I have mentioned that.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, do you recall any instance in which a leader in the party may have argued in behalf of one thing at one time and then very shortly afterward been compelled to change entirely?

MR. DMYTRYK. This went on all the time. There was a well-known incident that everybody got a good laugh out of in Hollywood, even the Communists, I must say. They were the only ones who actually knew about it. It was where Herbert Biberman had made a very powerful speech, impassioned speech, in favor of—I don't know if it was a personality or party line, one day. The official party line changed the following afternoon. The following day he made an equally impassioned speech in direct contrast to the speech he had made 2 days before.

MR. TAVENNER. When do you consider your withdrew from the Communist Party?

MR. DMYTRYK. Well, I consider that I withdrew from the Communist Party in the fall of 1945. However, as I say, I was active in what are now called Communist Party fronts. I want to make this clear. I was still teaching at the People's Education Center until 1947. I was on the board of the arts, sciences, and professions council. I was a member of the "Hollywood Ten." So actually I didn't break, I want to explain that, too, because I was in a peculiar position. As a man who had taken a gamble, who had made his choice in my appearance before the 1947 committee, I felt even though I had serious doubts about my position even during the hearings and shortly after that certainly, I felt that having taken this choice that I should follow it out to its logical conclusion. That is until such a time as the Supreme Court either decided we were right or we were wrong and went to jail. I felt if I suddenly started crying "Uncle" I was doing it simply to avoid the consequences of the decision, which was going to jail, although I had already before I went to jail made up my mind as soon as my jail sentence was over I would issue an affidavit and disclose whether I had or had not been a member of the party. Actually, I issued such an affidavit, a partial disclosure, not a complete disclosure, because a complete disclosure would have taken far too much time



and space to explain while I was in prison. I did this, because the Korean War—the way the Korean War was going so bothered me that I felt I had better make my position clear on that.

Mr. TAVENNER. To whom did you give this affidavit?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, Bartley Crum and Milton Diamond, two attorneys. Crum had been my attorney before. We took the deposition in the presence of Mr. Thiemann, who was the superintendent of the Mill Point Prison.

I might also say at this point that I have heard rumors, two different kinds, one that I made the affidavit because I had been offered a job at MGM at \$5,000 a week if I would make such an affidavit. This obviously has been proven untrue. The other is Bartley Crum said somebody, not a Communist, had approached him in New York and said, "I understand that they really put the works to Dmytryk in jail, they put the pressure on him, and that is why he made his affidavit." This, too, is not true. There was no pressure, nor has there been of any kind, nor have I ever been offered a bribe or job of any kind—I wish I had—to make either the affidavit or to come here, for that matter.

Mr. TAVENNER. This was a statement made purely on a voluntary basis by you, dictated by the demands of your own conscience?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Dictated by my own conscience absolutely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has there been any effort made since that time to recruit you again into the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, there was right when I came back from England. Herbert Biberman asked me to go back in the party. I told him I couldn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. There is a point that I omitted that I should have asked you earlier in your testimony. Do you recall an occasion when Mrs. Farogoh approached you about your uniting again in the Communist Party back, I think in 1945, or about that date?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes. This was actually after the incident I have mentioned with Lawson when I made up my mind I was going to drift away from the party. The party was being reorganized—I mean the association was finished, and they were reorganizing.

Mr. TAVENNER. This was at the time the Communist Political Association went out of being.

Mr. DMYTRYK. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the Communist Party came back in.

Mr. DMYTRYK. And the Communist Party came back in, so they were out re-signing everybody in effect. As a matter of fact, I was out on the street washing my car when Elizabeth Farogoh—I have mentioned the name before—asked me to re-sign. She said she wanted to reissue, that is, issue a new Communist Party card for me. I described to her what had gone on between Scott and Lawson and myself, and said that I was very doubtful about the party. She said, "Well, it won't hurt just to put your name in. You can do as you please about it, because actually things are in a great state of flux. We ourselves don't know what is going to happen." I must say I said O. K. I did not want to continue the discussion. I had already made up my mind I wasn't going back, but I didn't object to her putting my name back in again. But that is the last time anything of that sort happened.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that in 1945?



Mr. DMYTRYK. That was in 1945, the fall of 1945, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now I have asked you all I planned to ask you and all that has occurred to me during the course of your testimony. If there is any further information which you think the committee would be concerned with, I would be very glad for you to make it.

Mr. DMYTRYK. I can't think of anything right now.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions now.

Mr. WOOD. Perhaps members of the committee might think of something they would like to ask. Mr. Walter, are there any questions you would like to ask?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Dmytryk, it will probably be hours and perhaps days before there will be a real appreciation of the significance and the importance of what you have done here today. To me at least it is refreshing to find that there are people who are willing to assist in our feeble efforts to make a contribution in this world-wide struggle against communism. I feel that this committee is deeply indebted to you. You have come here without any feeling of rancor, which perhaps would be natural as a result of your experience and your being compelled to serve a sentence in jail. I think that you have made a very great contribution to the fight that all of us are making against communism.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to personally thank Mr. Dmytryk for his very clear and lucid statement of conditions that existed in Hollywood. I think he has contributed very greatly to the work of this committee.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Dmytryk, I too would like to add my thanks for your testimony and contribution. In addition, I would appreciate it very much if you would go into the matter of communism membership. That is, how you have concluded that certain members are members. We all know that sometimes a member carries a Communist Party membership card. Sometimes they weren't allowed to. There are some members that attend Communist Party cell meetings and other functions of the Communist Party several times. And then it has come to my attention that there are Communist Party members, subversives, in this country, who have neither carried Communist Party cards or identification of any kind and have not attended meetings, particularly in the espionage field. So it would enlighten us, I think, considerably if you could tell generally what policy the Communist Party had with reference to carrying membership cards, and so forth.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, I think that the Communist Party policy, to the best of my knowledge, was very fluid in this respect. They examined each person in regard to his qualifications, the kind of work he could do best. I have actually been present at conversations when there was a discussion about whether a certain person who had been an active member of certain Communist fronts and showed that he was willing to take part in these activities—when it was discussed as to whether or not he should be approached and invited into the party to become a member of the party.

I know, although I can't identify it specifically, but I remember of at least one instance where it was decided that the person should not be asked to be a party member; that he would actually be more effective if he worked—and, as a matter of fact, to be perfectly fair, I want to say this person who was being discussed probably had no idea he was being discussed by the Communist Party members or that they were even considering asking him, or he was working with Communist members and therefore it was better under certain circumstances that he never be allowed to know or be asked to become a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Dmytryk, I share the belief as it has been expressed by the other members of the committee, that certainly what you have had to say today has contributed a great deal in the way of more perfect understanding on the part of the committee members and of the American public as to the physical operations of the Communist Party organization, with particular reference to Hollywood.

I would like to have some comments on this. Much has been said with respect to the outlawry of the Communist Party, and of legislation directed to the outlawing of the party. Objections have been made to such proposal on the grounds that it might tend to drive the Communist Party underground. Would you care to make any comment so far as the operations of the party are concerned?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I would like to read a wire I got here, and the important part of this wire is simply that it relates an interview on Louella Parsons' program last Sunday night between Louella Parsons and a man named Matt Cvetic. I believe he is the man who wrote a book called *I Was a Communist For the FBI*. Now, in the course of this interview Louella Parsons asked him:

"What about the argument that these trials drive the Reds further underground?" This is the same argument you are talking about, the question of outlawing the party. He replied, "Don't fall for that. The Reds try to put that idea across to discourage these trials, but the truth is the Commies always work underground. Anything that brings them in the open hurts them." Then he says, "That is why Hollywood must support Parks and Hayden to encourage more people to speak out." Parsons then asked how smart personalities like Parks and Hayden could be gotten in the party. He replied: "The really frightening cleverness of the Communists is how they understand appealing to people's best emotions—their tolerance—their broadmindedness, and then use those good emotions for their own end."

I think I have gone into that in some detail. To give you my own ideas on that, I think actually this committee—and I am glad you asked me that question, since I think I am a constituent of yours, I—

Mr. JACKSON. Almost everyone who sits in "the chair" is.

Mr. DMYTRYK (continuing). I can talk to you, and you have to listen to me. So I hear. I think that you as a member of this committee, let me say, have a great responsibility to the people of the United States. I think the people of the United States in general have been forced into a very contradictory position. On the one hand people say—important people, people in authority, and important columnists, and people of that sort—that the Communist Party is a legal party; that anyone has a right to belong to the Communist Party.

On the other hand, they intimate that anybody who is a Communist should be fired from his job, should not have a position of trust.

Now, if the Communist Party is a legal party, every Communist who is a member of that party should certainly have the legal protection of the Government of the United States. He should have the right to do what he wishes. What is really happening is that there is being encouraged in this country a kind of mild lynch law or law by vigilance committee. Groups are out to say, "This man is a Communist. Therefore, fire him."

I do believe, as I have indicated clearly here today, I think the Communist Party is conspiratorial, subversive, and even in certain cases treasonable. I think for that reason there is no question in my mind—and there is certainly no question in these days of present danger—that the Communist Party should be outlawed, and you will remove the American people from a great contradiction in doing things that really aren't in the best interests of the American Government.

MR. JACKSON. One more question, if I may, Mr. Chairman. What would you call the final test of credibility of a witness purporting to be a former Communist who has changed his opinions in the period which has intervened between his membership and the present time, and who appears before a committee of this kind? As one who is very familiar with the Communist Party and with people who were in it, what would you say the test of credibility should be?

MR. DMYTRYK. Well, I don't know. I sit here in a kind of prejudiced position right now. I am not sure I can answer that question.

MR. JACKSON. Let me put it this way. Would you say the test of credibility certainly would have to be primarily the willingness to name names, places, and circumstances surrounding such membership?

MR. DMYTRYK. I personally believe so. That is why I am doing it. I think if a man says that he is convinced that the Communist Party is a subversive or criminal organization, that he certainly shouldn't mind giving names.

I know that there have been comments—I don't mean by the Communists but even among certain progressives and liberals—that people who talk are in effect informers. I heard that so much that I went to the dictionary and looked up the word. An informer, roughly speaking, is a man who informs against colleagues or former colleagues, who are engaged in criminal activity. I think the Communists, by using this word against people, are in effect admitting they are engaged in criminal activity. I never heard of anybody informing on the Boy Scouts.

MR. JACKSON. One last question, Mr. Chairman. A great many witnesses have appeared here in the past, and unquestionably there will be more in the future, who will appear and take their refuge under the protection of certain provisions of the Constitution, specifically the first and fifth amendments. Nobody questions that right. What is your opinion of the sincerity or devotion to American ideals or principles of those witnesses who refuse to answer any questions posed by the committee which touch upon membership in the Communist Party or Communist-front organizations?



Mr. DMYTRYK. Again it is a little hard for me to comment on that. I know this. I know from my own experience that the general assumption on everybody's part, if a man refuses to answer, is that he must be a Communist. I know this happened to me after the 1947 hearings. I was under no illusions about that. I knew the minute I refused to testify everybody in the United States who read about it or heard about it automatically assumed I was a Communist.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you think that is an unreasonable assumption?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I make the same assumption myself.

Mr. JACKSON. So do I. No further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Dmytryk, I too wish to compliment you on your forthright, refreshing statement. I know I as an individual member of the committee have learned a great deal, and I am indebted to you for giving us inside information as to the operations of the Communist activities as you have expressed them.

I have one specific question: During the time that you were confined to jail was any effort made by the Communists to exploit your wife, for example, knowing of her anxiety for you, to enter into or take part in Communist activities on the assumption it would aid in your release?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, I have already mentioned one incident of that. As a matter of fact, that is the only incident I can think of that went on outside of the activities purely of let's say, the wives of the ten. I believe she signed petitions to have me paroled, to have all of us paroled, and that sort of thing. But these were purely activities of the ten, in which of course she had a deep interest. I can think of no specific case of using her for outside purposes, outside of this one I talked about, the junket to Sacramento. Because I am sure she would have had nothing to do with them. As a matter of fact, she was taken on this junket because they were to ask the people in the convention to pass a resolution for our release, or something of that sort.

Mr. POTTER. When were you released from jail?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I was released on November 15, 1950.

Mr. POTTER. And since that time has any effort been made by your former colleagues in the jail or former colleagues of the Hollywood Ten to bring you back in the party or to ask you whether you would testify before the committee or find out what you were going to do?

Mr. DMYTRYK. No. One thing was done. This only illustrates how a person can continue to be naive. A short time after I came out of prison, about 2 weeks later Herbert Biberman was released from prison, because he also had a 6-month sentence. He came to me and asked me to cosign a letter with him asking the parole board to parole the other eight. I agreed, on the basis that it would not be political. It wasn't. It was simply on the basis—I think I had an honest point of view about that since we had only served 6 months and the other men were in for exactly the same crime we were in for, it seemed unfair they should serve a year. It was also my understanding that this was a letter that would only go to the board of parole. However, Mr. Biberman released the letter to the press, primarily the Daily Worker or the People's World. I don't know which of those. He announced it from the platform of a meeting. I think this started everybody thinking I was right back in the groove again, which wasn't true. I thought people asked for parole for murderers and thieves



and other things. I thought since I had been through all this with these men—I had served 6 months. I felt guilty getting out while they were still in. After that there was some contact purely on a social basis, which we avoided. That is about all that was ever done.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to thank you again.

Mr. WOOD. Further questions from counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Dmytryk, since your release from prison have you been employed in any capacity?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I have not.

Mr. JACKSON. Either here or abroad?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I have not.

Mr. JACKSON. You have not?

Mr. DMYTRYK. No.

Mr. JACKSON. What was your last work?

Mr. DMYTRYK. The last thing here, of course, was my employment at RKO in 1947. I went to England, made two pictures in England for independent companies, for J. Arthur Rank release.

Mr. JACKSON. What was that?

Mr. DMYTRYK. One was called *The Hidden Room*, just a sort of suspense melodrama, with Bob Newton. The other was a picture that has two titles over here. The first was *Give Us This Day*. The other was *Salt to the Devil*. However, it is better known as the movie version of *Christ in Concrete*, which is the story of a New York bricklayer and his troubles.

Mr. JACKSON. Has it played a release in the United States?

Mr. DMYTRYK. A few releases. The other has played pretty generally.

Mr. JACKSON. What was the acceptance here and abroad?

Mr. DMYTRYK. The acceptance abroad has been very broad. I won practically all the prizes in Europe last year as best director of the year. I won the Venice Festival Award, the Paris Press Cup, the Vichy Festival prize. The picture won several prizes at various European festivals. Here we got—I would call it mixed reception. Some critics rave about it. Others didn't like it. A few thought they detected signs of Communist Party line in it, but this has become so because they suspected me naturally of being a Communist, and they had reasons to do that. However, there was no Communist Party line in the picture. But, as I say, it hasn't played enough, because many exhibitors are afraid to play my pictures over here, so that it is hard to say how the people would accept it.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you again for your testimony.

Mr. WOOD. Further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Permit me, Mr. Dmytryk, to add my feeble expression of appreciation for your coming here and for the assistance you have given this committee. Not only that, but the information that you have given to the American people, millions of whom haven't the vaguest idea or conception of what the Communist movement in America stands for and its real aims and purposes. I feel your contribution is a great deal more valuable to the American people than it is even to this committee. And for all of it I express to you my very deep appreciation.

If there is no further reason to detain this witness, Mr. Counsel, you may excuse him.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. WOOD. The committee will stand adjourned at this point, subject to being called together at such time as it may be deemed necessary. There will be no meeting tomorrow.

(Whereupon, at 4:10 p. m., the committee adjourned subject to call.)

## COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION- PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 2

WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 1951

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

### PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to call at 10 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Francis C. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder (appearance as noted in transcript), Clyde Doyle, James B. Frazier, Jr., Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; William A. Wheeler and Courtney E. Owens, investigators; John W. Carrington, clerk; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. WOOD. Let us have order, please, and let the record show that there are present the following members of the committee: Mr. Walter, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, Mr. Velde, Mr. Kearney, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Potter, and Mr. Wood, a quorum of the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call as the first witness Mr. Leonardo Bercovici.

Mr. WOOD. Will you raise your right hand, please? You solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF LEONARDO BERCOVICI, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, EUGENE GRESSMAN

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. BERCOVICI. My name is Leonardo Bercovici.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented here by counsel?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Yes; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. GRESSMAN. Eugene Gressman, of Washington, D. C.

Mr. WOOD. Your office address?

Mr. GRESSMAN. 1830 Jefferson Place NW.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Witness, any time during the progress of your examination you have the privilege of conferring with your counsel.

Mr. BERCOVICI. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bercovici, will you spell your name, please?

Mr. BERCOVICI. L-e-o-n-a-r-d-o B-e-r-c-o-v-i-c-i.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been known by any other name?

Mr. BERCOVICI. In the past I have used several pen names; that was a long time ago; but not to my knowledge have I ever been known as Leonard Berkowitz, as stated on the subpoena served on me.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will you please request the witness to speak louder.

Mr. WOOD. Will you speak louder, please. We can't hear you up here.

Mr. BERCOVICI. I would like to present this birth certificate in evidence.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the reason is that the subpoena served upon you stated that you were known by some other name?

Mr. BERCOVICI. The subpoena stated Leonard Berkowitz, also known as Leonardo Bercovici.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you have not been known by the name you mentioned?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to offer the birth certificate in evidence and ask that it be marked "Bercovici Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. WOOD. It will be received.

(The certificate above referred to, marked "Bercovici Exhibit No. 1," is filed herewith.)

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. BERCOVICI. In New York City, January 4, 1908.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I live in Westwood, Calif., 10520 Garwood Place.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you please state to the committee what your educational background has been?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Very briefly, I attended high school at Morristown, N. J., and went to New York University and Yale School of Drama.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been the record of your employment since finishing school?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Since finishing school I did a considerable amount of free-lance radio work.

Mr. WOOD. I didn't understand what you said.

Mr. BERCOVICI. Since finishing school I did a considerable amount of free-lance radio work. In 1937 I came to Hollywood. From that time on, intermittently, I worked for several studios—Warner Bros.; Paramount; RKO; Sam Goldwyn; David Selznick; and several others.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say you worked for them, what did you do?

Mr. BERCOVICI. As a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are some of the screen plays you have taken part in writing?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I have taken part in writing the Bishop's Wife, for Sam Goldwyn; Portrait of Jenny, for David Selznick; Kiss the Blood Off My Hands; Lost Moment; Racket Busters; and probably several others.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?



Mr. BERCOVICI. I should like to make this clear now. I am not a member of the Communist Party or in sympathy with the beliefs of the Communist Party as I understand them. In the event my country is attacked by any country I would feel it my duty and my privilege to defend my country in any capacity that I may be called upon. As to the balance of the question regarding past membership in the Communist Party—

Mr. WOOD. Up to this moment you have not been asked that.

Mr. BERCOVICI. That is correct.

Mr. WOOD. You have just been asked if you are a member.

Mr. BERCOVICI. That is true. I am sorry.

Mr. WOOD. Does that cover that question?

Mr. BERCOVICI. That covers that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Richard J. Collins, also a screen writer?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate or degrade me, and it violates my privilege under the Constitution, and especially under the fifth and first amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. As I understand your contention, you assert that your answer to the question as to whether or not you are acquainted with Richard Collins might subject you to criminal prosecution, and therefore you desire the protection of the fifth amendment to the Constitution in your refusal to answer?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I stand on my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Mr. Edward Dmytryk, a director in the moving-picture industry?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bercovici, Mr. Collins has testified before this committee in the following manner relating to you:

Question. Have you mentioned in the course of your testimony the name of Leonardo Bercovici?

Mr. COLLINS. No. I have worked with Bercovici on a film that was supposed to be about the San Francisco Conference for the OWI.

Question. Will you spell the name, please?

Mr. COLLINS. B-e-r-c-o-v-i-c-i.

Question. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. COLLINS. At that time he was.

Is that statement correct?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. WALTER. Did Mr. Collins fix the date, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. What date, Mr. Bercovici, was the San Francisco Conference, if you recall?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Oh, I believe the San Francisco Conference was in 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you working, at that time or shortly thereafter, on a film for the OWI, Office of War Information?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the ground that it might incriminate me or degrade me, and that it violates my privilege under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. WOOD. We still can't hear you, Mr. Bercovici.

Mr. BERCOVICI. I said I still decline to answer that question on the ground that it might incriminate or degrade me, and it violates my

privilege under the Constitution, and especially under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. What crime do you think you might be charged with? You admit you were working on a picture for the OWI.

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the same ground. (Representative Morgan M. Moulder entered hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you were employed by the Office of War Information, were you not?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I was employed by the Office of War Information in 1943, I believe.

Mr. WOOD. Let the record show that Mr. Moulder of the committee is present.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you so employed in 1945?

Mr. BERCOVICI. No; I was not so employed in 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your employment began in 1943?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Yes, and I believe, to the best of my knowledge, it terminated in 1943 as well.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your employment?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I was employed to write a script for the OWI.

Mr. TAVENNER. And what was that script?

Mr. BERCOVICI. It was a script about Italians in America.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you sign an application for employment?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I signed an application—

Mr. TAVENNER. Go ahead.

Mr. BERCOVICI. I believe to the best of my knowledge I signed an application after I completed my work, actually. I am not sure of that, but that is the way my memory serves me.

Mr. WOOD. You mean you were employed by the Office of War Information without signing a formal application for employment?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I believe there was some kind of a civil-service form, but it is my impression that I did not sign that until sometime after, or until the completion of that particular script I was working on.

Mr. WOOD. Did you receive compensation for your services from the Government?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Yes; I did.

Mr. WOOD. Had you received that compensation prior to the time you signed that application or form?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I believe I received it on a per diem basis.

Mr. WOOD. But you received it prior to the time you signed that application?

Mr. BERCOVICI. To the best of my knowledge that is true.

Mr. WOOD. Who approached you on the subject of doing this work for the Office of War Information?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I don't recall exactly. The man in charge of the whole OWI Motion-Picture Division was a man called Robert Riskin, and I believe a man called Joseph Krumgold—

Mr. WOOD. Joseph who?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Krumgold, K-r-u-m-g-o-l-d.

Mr. WOOD. Where was he located?

Mr. BERCOVICI. He at that time was working for the OWI.

Mr. WOOD. Where?

Mr. BERCOVICI. In New York City.

Mr. WOOD. Was he the man who approached you about doing this work for the Office of War Information?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I don't know that he actually approached me, but I was in the building and I knew Mr. Krungold from college, and I believe he asked if I would be interested in writing a script for OWI, and I said I was.

Mr. WOOD. You say you believe?

Mr. BERCOVICI. That is the best of my knowledge.

Mr. WOOD. And is that the way you obtained your employment?

Mr. BERCOVICI. To the best of my knowledge.

Mr. WOOD. Were you approached by anyone in OWI prior to the time you gained employment other than the man you mentioned?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. VELDE. What did Robert Riskin have to do with your employment with OWI?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I don't know that he had anything to do with it, but I imagine approval of all jobs had to go through Mr. Riskin, because he was in charge of the whole OWI Motion Picture Division. That is the only connection I had with Mr. Riskin.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you sign an affidavit of any character when employed or while employed by the OWI relating to your past membership or present membership in various types of organizations?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I believe I signed some sort of an affidavit that may have included that statement.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you sign an affidavit to the effect that you were not a member of an organization which believed in the overthrow of the United States Government?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I may have signed such a document; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you answer that question?

Mr. BERCOVICI. May I consult counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BERCOVICI. To the best of my knowledge, I signed the entire document. As to the particular elements in it, I would have to have my memory refreshed on it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Edward Dmytryk testified before this committee relating to you in the course of his testimony as to his attendance at Communist Party meetings. His testimony is as follows:

Question. Describe each of these groups to which you were assigned.

Mr. DMYTRYK. The second group I was assigned to met in Hollywood. In this group I saw Herbert Biberman, Arnold Manoff, Mickey Uris, and Leonardo Bercovi.

Did you meet with the group to which Mr. Dmytryk referred in his testimony?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the ground it may tend to incriminate or degrade me and it violates my privileges under the Constitution, and especially the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Herbert Biberman?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the same ground.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Arnold Manoff?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Mickey Uris?



Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bercovici, the testimony of both Mr. Collins and Mr. Dmytryk related to the year 1945. You decline to answer questions relating to your alleged Communist Party membership at that time, but you state you are not now a member of the Communist Party. When did you cease to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds as other questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. This is May 1951. Were you a member on January 1, 1950?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member on December 31, 1950?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Today is the 16th day of May. You state you are not a member of the Communist Party today. Were you a member yesterday?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KEARNEY. Are you a member today?

Mr. BERCOVICI. No; I am not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you mean to say it would degrade you to say when you ceased to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. WALTER. Do I take it from that you think it would be degrading to state when you left the Communist Party?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bercovici, the committee is in possession of information indicating that you were a speaker on June 12, 1945, at a meeting of the National Lawyers' Guild at the Rosslyn Hotel, Los Angeles. Do you recall that?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is also in possession of information indicating you were a member of the American-Russian Institute; that is, of the southern California chapter. Is that correct?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer on the ground it may tend to incriminate or degrade me.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been testimony before the committee of the effort made by certain groups within the Screen Writers' Guild to control the election of officers in 1948. The committee has information indicating you were the signer of a letter in November 1948 addressed to the members, in which you endorsed the candidacy of Lester Cole and Ring Lardner, Jr. I would like to ask you to tell the committee the circumstances under which you signed that letter, if you did sign it?

Mr. BERCOVICI. May I consult counsel, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time connected with the California Labor School at Los Angeles?

Mr. BERCOVICI. May I consult counsel?



Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., left the hearing room.)

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name appears as one of those who signed an amicus curiae brief filed with the Supreme Court of the United States in the case against John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo. I would like to ask you who requested you to sign that brief, or to join in the brief?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds, that it may tend to incriminate or degrade me, and that it violates my privileges under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke a little earlier in your testimony, Mr. Bercovici, regarding the affidavit which you signed when employed by the OWI. First I would like to ask you what the date of your employment was, when you first began your work, or first made your arrangements with OWI for employment?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I don't know the precise date, Mr. Tavenner. I believe it was in the spring or summer of 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a copy of personnel affidavit, Standard Form No. 47, and I will ask you to look at it and state if that is a similar affidavit to that which you signed (handing affidavit to witness)?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Thank you. (After examining document and conferring with his counsel.) Mr. Tavenner, I don't know if this is the exact form that I signed. It is a long time ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will ask you to examine the affidavit again and state whether or not the affidavit which you signed contained the language appearing in paragraph marked "1"?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Mr. Tavenner, it may have been something like that, but I cannot be sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Paragraph 1 of the affidavit to which I referred states:

It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any capacity by an agency of the Federal Government whose compensation or any part thereof is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress to have membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of Government in the United States.

And at the end of the affidavit is the statement that—

I am not a member of any political party or organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., returned to hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Were you a member, at the time that you became employed by the OWI, of any political party or organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the grounds that it violates my constitutional privileges, and especially under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to ask at the present time.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I would like to ask the witness a question.

Mr. Witness, I think your answer to our counsel a while back was read from a prepared statement by you, wasn't it?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Yes, it was.

Mr. DOYLE. I refer now to the statement you read in which you said that you are not now a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. BERCOVICI. The exact language was, "I am not a member of the Communist Party."

Mr. DOYLE. And I think a part of that answer was that you would fight on the side of the United States of America if it was attacked?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I will be glad to read it again:

I am not a member of the Communist Party or in sympathy with the beliefs of the Communist Party as I understand them. In the event my country is attacked by any country I would feel it my duty and my privilege to defend my country in any capacity that I may be called upon.

Mr. DOYLE. That is the part of the statement I want to ask you a question about. Was there a period of time in recent times, or at all, when you would not have fought on the side of the United States of America? You volunteered the statement you would now. What about a year ago, or 2 years ago, or 3 years ago, or when you were a member of the Communist Party, would you then have fought on the side of the United States of America? I ask you that in good faith, because you volunteered that statement. You came prepared with that statement, apparently written out, to volunteer that information to this committee. That is true, isn't it? I am asking you in good faith, as one American citizen to another: Was there a time when you were a member of the Communist Party and when you would not have fought on the side of the United States of America?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the grounds it violates my constitutional privileges under the fifth and first amendments.

Mr. DOYLE. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. I believe you stated you were born in 1908?

Mr. BERCOVICI. That is right.

Mr. FRAZIER. Did you serve in the last World War?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I did not.

Mr. FRAZIER. Where were you employed then?

Mr. BERCOVICI. During the war?

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes.

Mr. BERCOVICI. In 1943, as I stated, I worked for the OWI. I also wrote a picture for the Army.

Mr. FRAZIER. Where are you employed now?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I am not employed now.

Mr. FRAZIER. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. In reference to counsel's question regarding the loyalty affidavit, were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you signed the loyalty affidavit when you were employed by OWI?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. MOULDER. In your statement you said you would defend our country in the event of an attack. Would you fight for our country in the event it became involved in any war?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I would fight for my country under any circumstances.

Mr. MOULDER. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Bercovici, I would like to go into your employment with OWI a little further. You began your employment with OWI in 1943. Do you remember approximately what time of the year?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I can't be entirely sure about that. I feel it was some time in the spring or early summer. I am not quite sure.

Mr. VELDE. How long were you associated with the OWI?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I think in the general vicinity of 6 months.

Mr. VELDE. What was the salary paid you by the Government in those 6 months?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I think something like \$10 a day. I am not sure it was even in the form of a salary. I think it was on some kind of per diem basis. I am not clear on that.

Mr. VELDE. Then you deny you had anything to do with writing the picture in connection with the San Francisco conference; is that right?

Mr. BERCOVICI. May I consult counsel, please?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BERCOVICI. Mr. Velde, I did not deny that. I merely declined to answer whether or not I participated in that film regarding the San Francisco conference.

Mr. VELDE. Did you attend the San Francisco conference, or were you in San Francisco at the time of the conference?

Mr. BERCOVICI. May I consult counsel?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that on the same ground.

Mr. VELDE. You mean that it may tend to incriminate you to admit that you were in San Francisco in 1945 during the peace conference, or during the San Francisco conference?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. VELDE. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. General Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. When you read your prepared statement that you are not a member of the Communist Party, were the words "at present" included in that statement?

Mr. BERCOVICI. The statement merely said "I am not a member of the Communist Party," that is all.

Mr. KEARNEY. I understood you to say you would be glad to defend your country in time of war?

Mr. BERCOVICI. The statement was, "In the event my country is attacked by any country I would feel it my duty and my privilege to defend my country in any capacity that I may be called upon."

Mr. KEARNEY. You were not in service during the last war?

Mr. BERCOVICI. No, I was not. I was IV-F.

Mr. KEARNEY. IV-F?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Yes, I was.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think that is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. In your prepared statement did you say that you are not in sympathy with the principles of the Communist Party? What is that portion of your prepared statement?

Mr. BERCOVICI (reading) :

I am not a member of the Communist Party or in sympathy with the beliefs of the Communist Party as I understand them.

Mr. POTTER. What are the principles of the Communist Party that you disagree with?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Well, I suppose that one of the beliefs of the Communist Party is the eventual establishment of some Soviet form of government in the United States. Insofar as this may violate the rights of the individuals as we know them—freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, freedom to write, freedom to worship—insofar as those violations are concerned, I am opposed to the beliefs of the Communist Party.

Mr. POTTER. When did you establish in your own mind the disagreement that you have just cited?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the grounds it may tend to incriminate or degrade me.

Mr. POTTER. Have you always believed that the Communist Party held the principles that you have just stated?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. POTTER. Do you believe the Communist Party is subversive?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. POTTER. Are you a member of the Ku Klux Klan?

Mr. BERCOVICI. No; I am not.

Mr. POTTER. Have you ever been a member?

Mr. BERCOVICI. No; I have not.

Mr. POTTER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate or degrade me, and it violates my privileges under the Constitution, and especially under the fifth and first amendments.

Mr. POTTER. In other words, you make a distinction. It doesn't tend to degrade you to tell the committee you have never been a member of the Ku Klux Klan, but you feel it does to tell the committee whether you have ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BERCOVICI. The answer to the first question is incriminating and the answer to the second is not.

Mr. POTTER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Counsel, any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. Not at this time, sir. It would be satisfactory if he would let the staff know where he could be reached the rest of the day in the event we decided to recall him.

Mr. WOOD. With that understanding, that you advise the clerk of the committee where you can be reached throughout the remainder of the day in the event the committee desires to contact you, you may be excused until 10:30 tomorrow.



Mr. BERCOVICI. Thank you. Mr. Tavenner, please, I would like to submit this statement to be filed with the committee.

(The statement referred to was filed with the committee.)

(Witness temporarily excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, there was subpoenaed for appearance here this morning a person by the name of Mrs. Beatrice Hammer. We received yesterday a doctor's certificate relating to her, and her counsel, I understand, took the matter up with you a few days ago about her illness and her inability to be here today. I call the matter to your attention and suggest that the doctor's certificate be filed in the record of the proceedings.

Mr. WOOD. We have the doctor's certificate, and it was suggested by counsel for the witness that in the event the committee decided to do so—and it is before the committee now—she will be glad to be subjected to examination by any physician the committee might designate. It appears, however, she can be before the committee in the next 30 days.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call as the next witness Mr. Alvin Hammer.

Mr. WOOD. Are you Mr. Hammer?

Mr. HAMMER. I am.

Mr. WOOD. Will you raise your right hand, please, and be sworn. You solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HAMMER. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat, sir.

#### TESTIMONY OF ALVIN HAMMER, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, MARTIN POPPER

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Alvin Hammer?

Mr. HAMMER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. HAMMER. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. POPPER. Martin Popper, 160 Broadway, New York City.

Mr. WOOD. At any time during the course of your examination you have the privilege of conferring with your counsel as you may desire.

Mr. HAMMER. May I submit a statement, please?

Mr. WOOD. At the conclusion of your testimony we will be glad to receive such statement as you desire to submit.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Hammer?

Mr. HAMMER. I was born January 2, 1915, Lower East Side, New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is Alvin Hammer your professional name or is it your real name?

Mr. HAMMER. I was born Irving Dratler, D-r-a-t-l-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is Alvin Hammer your correct name, or is it merely a professional name?

Mr. HAMMER. It is a professional name.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you married?

Mr. HAMMER. Yes; I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your wife's name?

Mr. HAMMER. Beatrice Hammer.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was her name prior to marriage?

Mr. HAMMER. Jacobs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did she also use the name Stevens, Beatrice Stevens?

Mr. HAMMER. At this point I would like to claim the privilege of the fifth amendment to the Constitution and decline to answer any questions which might tend to incriminate me, and also the privilege of the first amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you explain to the committee how the giving of your wife's name may tend to incriminate you?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the ground previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You give the committee no information whatever upon which it may base a decision as to how and in what manner you might be in danger of being prosecuted for a criminal offense by giving the name of your wife; is that correct?

Mr. HAMMER (after conferring with his counsel). I said upon the privilege I have claimed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hammer, will you state what your occupation is, please?

Mr. HAMMER. I am a free-lance motion-picture actor; free-lance actor. I am not under contract now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Particularly in the motion-picture field?

Mr. HAMMER. Well, wherever I can obtain employment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state briefly to the committee what your educational background has been?

Mr. HAMMER. I attended Public School No. 6, Manhattan, N. Y., and 2 years at DeWitt Clinton High School.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you complete that training?

Mr. HAMMER. When did I graduate?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; when did you graduate?

Mr. HAMMER. Graduate from DeWitt Clinton High School?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HAMMER. I didn't graduate. I said I went there 2 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you terminate your course there?

Mr. HAMMER. Approximately 1928.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state to the committee what your employment has been since 1928 and where?

Mr. HAMMER. Well, I took any job that I could get, being a young fellow trying to make a living. I worked in the garment center and various—

Mr. TAVENNER. I mean in your profession.

Mr. HAMMER. Oh, oh. Well, I did what is called in the profession club dates, playing for private parties, entertaining, sometimes, and trying to get jobs on Broadway, knocking on producers' doors.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you live in New York? Didn't you move from New York to Hollywood?

Mr. HAMMER. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. About when did you go to Hollywood?

Mr. HAMMER. I arrived in Hollywood July 19, 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time where had you been living?

Mr. HAMMER. Sunnyside, Long Island.

Mr. TAVENNER. What address in Sunnyside?

Mr. HAMMER. I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't recall? How long had you been living there?

Mr. HAMMER. A couple years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to that time where did you live?

Mr. HAMMER. Jackson Heights, Long Island.

Mr. TAVENNER. And before that did you live at 13 West Seventeenth Street, back in 1938?

Mr. HAMMER. I don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean you are uncertain whether you did or not?

Mr. HAMMER. We may have sublet for a couple months. I don't remember way back in 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of your efforts to obtain employment in New York. Were you successful in obtaining employment as a night-club entertainer in New York?

Mr. HAMMER. Yes, sure; that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, for whom did you work?

Mr. HAMMER. Various employers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you name some of them?

Mr. HAMMER (after conferring with his counsel). Village Vanguard. This is quite an extensive list. Cafe Society. Rainbow Room.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you work at Cafe Society?

Mr. HAMMER. About 1940, I believe; about 1940.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you there?

Mr. HAMMER. Well, different engagements. I don't remember the exact length.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time were you employed at Cafe Society?

Mr. HAMMER. Altogether about 18 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that employment of 18 months begin?

Mr. HAMMER. I don't exactly recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Approximately?

Mr. HAMMER. I don't have any employment records with me.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand, but you can get at it with reasonable certainty, I am sure.

Mr. HAMMER. Approximately 19—; I can't give you any months.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not asking for that. Just the approximate date.

Mr. HAMMER. Sometime in 1941. I have already stated that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you said you had been there from 1940 on.

Mr. HAMMER. Sometime during that period.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated for a period of 18 months probably beginning in 1941.

Mr. POPPER. He didn't say that, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Perhaps I misunderstood you. Will you state it again?

Mr. HAMMER. I said in combined engagements probably 18 months. We get different bookings and then go back. I said altogether about 18 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who engaged you?

Mr. HAMMER. Mr. Barney Josephson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Barney J-o-s-e-p-h-s-o-n?

Mr. HAMMER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your employment at Cafe Society while employed there?

Mr. HAMMER. I did special material, songs, skits, satires.

Mr. KEARNEY. May I ask a question there, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is Barney Josephson a brother of Leon Josephson?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker of February 19, 1938, page 2, announced that members of the Young Communist League had denounced Japan and called for a boycott of its goods in a demonstration before the Japanese consulate at 500 Fifth Avenue, New York City, on the previous day, February 18, and the newspaper stated that in addition to pickets carrying signs, Al Hammer, of 13 West Seventeenth Street, played the role of Emperor Hirohito, dressed in coolie clothes and pulling a rickshaw with Death as the passenger. Do you recall that?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Young Communist League at that time in New York City?

Mr. HAMMER. Mr. Tavenner, since this organization is listed in an assorted catalog of subversive organizations, I decline to answer—

Mr. WOOD. Let us omit the adjectives. Do you decline to answer?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the ground previously stated; it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. WALTER. Did you call those organizations sordid organizations?

Mr. HAMMER. Assorted, a-s-s-o-r-t-e-d.

Mr. TAVENNER. Coming up to a much later date, I have an excerpt from the Daily People's World of March 26, 1948, the heading of which is "High time skits," and this article which I am going to hand to you, refers to a number of skits being produced in the Embassy Auditorium under the sponsorship of the Civil Rights Congress. Included among the sponsors appears the name Al Hammer, A-l Hammer. I would like you to look at that and state whether Al Hammer is the same person as Alvin Hammer?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You will note the name appearing among the list of sponsors immediately preceding yours is a person named Art Smith, A-r-t Smith. Do you know Art Smith?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given the name of Art Smith before leaving New York City as a person whom you should look up upon arriving in Hollywood?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated you arrived in Hollywood in July 1943. After your arrival there, did you become acquainted with a person by the name of Frank Tuttle, a director in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with Herbert Biberman?



Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did your wife accompany you to California, or were you married when you went to California in 1943?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. That is July 1943.

Mr. HAMMER. I came to California alone and my wife followed about 10 weeks later.

Mr. WOOD. What was the date of your marriage?

Mr. HAMMER. December 17, 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. After your arrival, did you become acquainted with Marjory Potts?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you and your wife jointly, or you individually, become membership director of branch F of the Northwest Section of the Los Angeles County Communist Political Association?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have in your possession the records of names, both the first and last names, of the membership of that section of the Communist Party, and a list of the transfers of persons in and out of the party from that section? Did you have it in your possession?

Mr. HAMMER (reading). I do not have now, and I did not have at the time I was served with the subpoena nor at any time during the current investigation by this committee, nor at any time during the year 1951, possession, custody, or control of any of the records called for by the subpoena. At none of these times mentioned by me have I known the whereabouts or the existence of any such records.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, what did you do with the records?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have the records in your possession in 1950?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hammer, the committee is in possession of information that while you were in New York you held 1943 Communist Party Book No. 11810; that is, a book in the Communist Party of the United States of America. Did you hold a Communist Party book in New York before going to California?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds it might incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us the circumstances under which you went to California?

Mr. HAMMER (after conferring with his counsel). I went to play at the Trocadero and to seek movie work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any connection there before leaving New York City?

Mr. HAMMER. I don't understand you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any contractual connection in California before leaving New York? Had you entered into any contract or made any arrangement prior to going to California; that is, arrangements for employment?

Mr. HAMMER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. With whom?

Mr. HAMMER. Through an agent, an employment agent.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the agent?

Mr. HAMMER. Kirt Frings, F-r-i-n-g-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was he located, in New York or in California?

Mr. HAMMER. In California.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you get in touch with him?

Mr. HAMMER (after conferring with his counsel). He came to New York seeking talent to sign up.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was instrumental in your meeting him?

Mr. HAMMER. Nobody.

Mr. TAVENNER. He sought you out rather than your seeking him out?

Mr. HAMMER. That is all I can recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee is in possession of information that after your arrival in California, as late as 1945, there was issued to you a Communist Political Association membership card No. 47354. Were you the holder of a card of the Communist Political Association in 1945 in California?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAMMER. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did a person by the name of Ruth Alland, A-l-l-a-n-d, from Baltimore, Md., live in your home with you and your wife while in California?

Mr. HAMMER (after conferring with his counsel). I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. What studios did you work for while in California?

Mr. HAMMER. All major studios and all independents.

Mr. TAVENNER. What are some of the principal screen plays in which you were engaged?

Mr. HAMMER. Well, I played in about 30 pictures—you know, sometimes just for a day or so—and I can't recall all the names of the pictures.

Mr. TAVENNER. Name those that you think were the top pictures that you took part in.

Mr. HAMMER. Well, there was Mother Wore Tights.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who produced that picture?

Mr. HAMMER. Twentieth Century-Fox. And a picture called Fabulous Suzanne.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who produced that picture?

Mr. HAMMER. An independent. I don't remember the name of the producer. I just am blank at the moment. I am not a big actor.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I noticed, Mr. Hammer, when counsel asked you whether or not you had certain books and records of a Communist

group, you took from your pocket a paper from which you apparently read your answer to that question; didn't you?

(Representative Francis E. Walter left hearing room.)

Mr. HAMMER. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. When did you prepare that answer to that particular question, anticipating that question?

Mr. HAMMER. As I say in the statement, it said on the subpoena.

Mr. DOYLE. But when did you prepare that answer to that particular question? You apparently anticipated that you would be asked that question.

Mr. WOOD. He was served with a subpoena duces tecum.

Mr. HAMMER. When was it prepared?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. HAMMER. I wrote it this morning.

Mr. DOYLE. I presume your nickname, or your name for short, due to the fact your name is Alvin, that your natural nickname is Al and has been for years; isn't that so? Isn't that your natural nickname? How would that incriminate you?

Mr. HAMMER. You have asked me several questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I will delete all but the one. You were and are commonly known as Al—aren't you?—by your close friends.

Mr. HAMMER. Well, you can call me Al.

Mr. DOYLE. That doesn't answer my question. That is the way you generally are called by those who know you?

Mr. HAMMER. They can call me anything but "Late for Breakfast." A lot of people call me Al.

Mr. DOYLE. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Hammer, do you have any trouble learning your script for these various pictures when you are in a play?

(Representatives Francis E. Walter returned to hearing room.)

Mr. HAMMER. I don't understand you.

Mr. FRAZIER. I say: Do you have any trouble learning your script, what you are supposed to say, when you are acting in a play or acting on the stage?

Mr. HAMMER. Sometimes I do; sometimes I don't.

Mr. FRAZIER. I just wanted to know because you don't seem to remember where you lived earlier, when you were younger, and there are many other questions you couldn't remember. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have a military record?

Mr. HAMMER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. You did register for the draft; didn't you?

Mr. HAMMER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. You carried your registration card with you?

Mr. HAMMER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Were you classified for the draft?

Mr. HAMMER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. What was your classification?

Mr. HAMMER. 4-F.

Mr. VELDE. Do you now carry a draft card?

Mr. HAMMER. I still have my draft card for World War II.

Mr. VELDE. World War II?

Mr. HAMMER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions? Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. The witness will be excused.

(The witness submitted a statement which was filed with the committee.)

(Witness excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Miss Bea Winters.

Mr. WOOD. Will you raise your right hand, please?

You solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss WINTERS. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Be seated.

### TESTIMONY OF BEA WINTERS, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, ABRAHAM GORENFELD

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Miss WINTERS. Bea Winters. However, I was baptized under the name of Bernadette.

Mr. TAVENNER. And the last name?

Miss WINTERS. Winters, W-i-n-t-e-r-s.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bernadette Winters?

Miss WINTERS. Right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Miss WINTERS. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. GORENFELD. Abraham Gorenfeld, G-o-r-e-n-f-e-l-d, of 756 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present address, Miss Winters?

Miss WINTERS. 1429 Havinghurst Drive, Hollywood, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you furnish the committee, please, a brief statement of your employment record?

Miss WINTERS. Yes. I worked at Universal Studio, RKO, Paramount—

Mr. TAVENNER. Give the approximate dates and speak a little louder, please.

Miss WINTERS. I think I started working at Universal, as well as I can remember, about 1936 or 1937, Universal Studio. I worked there for about 4 years, then went to RKO. I went to Paramount in 1940 or 1941, and around 1945 I went to Berg-Allen Berg, Inc.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to your going to Berg-Allen Berg, what was the nature of your employment with these various studios?

Miss WINTERS. As secretary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Secretary in what particular field or capacity?

Miss WINTERS. Secretary to whomsoever I might be assigned to in the studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed. You went to Berg-Allen Berg in 1945?

Miss WINTERS. That is correct.



Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your employment in the Berg-Allen Berg Agency?

Miss WINTERS. I was secretary there also.

Mr. TAVENNER. To whom were you secretary?

Miss WINTERS. Meta Reis Rosenberg.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances under which you became employed at Berg-Allen Berg?

Miss WINTERS. I had formerly worked for Mrs. Rosenberg for a period at Paramount, and when she left Paramount and went to Berg-Allen Berg she asked me to come and work for her there.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your duties as secretary to Mrs. Rosenberg?

Miss WINTERS. Well, general secretarial work, taking dictation, answering telephones, and taking care of the office when she was out at the studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were employed there, did you become acquainted with a sea captain by the name of Warwick Tompkins?

Miss WINTERS. I refuse to answer that question on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me in violation of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your reason again?

Miss WINTERS. I refuse to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me in violation of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by "in violation of the fifth amendment"?

Miss WINTERS. I understand the fifth amendment to protect a person from testifying against himself.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you feel that a truthful answer to that question might subject you to criminal prosecution? That is the ground upon which I understand that you refuse to answer the question; is that correct?

Miss WINTERS. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Sterling Hayden testified before the committee that he met you through Warwick Tompkins and, quoting his testimony, "One day she said to me, 'Why don't you stop talking and join the Communist Party?'" and as a result, Sterling Hayden testified that he did join the Communist Party. Did you have anything to do with recruiting Sterling Hayden into the Communist Party?

Miss WINTERS. I refuse to answer that question on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Miss WINTERS. I refuse to answer that question on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Miss WINTERS. I refuse to answer that question on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you affiliated in any way with the Hollywood Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council?

Miss WINTERS. I refuse to answer that question on the ground that it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. Where are you now employed, if you are employed?

Miss WINTERS. I am not now employed.

Mr. MOULDER. When were you last employed?

Miss WINTERS. April 10, 1951.

Mr. MOULDER. By whom were you then employed?

Miss WINTERS. Horizon Pictures, Inc.

Mr. MOULDER. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. How long have you lived in Hollywood, or in the area of Hollywood?

Miss WINTERS. I think since either 1936 or 1937, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. VELDE. Up to the present time?

Miss WINTERS. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. During that time, were you aware that there was a Communist movement on in Hollywood?

Miss WINTERS. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. VELDE. How would it tend to incriminate you to know that there was a Communist movement in Hollywood?

Miss WINTERS. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. VELDE. Have you ever known Communists in Hollywood?

Miss WINTERS. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. VELDE. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Miss Winters, during the period of time you were employed in the several studios as a secretary, how was the decision made as to whom you were going to work for? Was it a secretarial pool, or did you go to a studio with the understanding you would work for a particular person?

Miss WINTERS. Usually a secretarial pool.

Mr. JACKSON. For whom did you work during the time you were at Universal Studios?

Miss WINTERS. That would take quite a while. I started out working in the stenographic department, in the pool. During my period of employment there I worked for Mr. Cochran, who was president of the company, when he was on the coast. I worked for a casting director.

Mr. JACKSON. Who was the casting director?

Miss WINTERS. Dan Kelly. And I worked for the head of the studio and his assistant.

Mr. JACKSON. Who was that at that time?

Miss WINTERS. The head of the studio at that time was Charles Rogers. And I worked for a few writers and directors; I don't quite remember how many.

Mr. JACKSON. And to whom were you secretary at RKO?

Miss WINTERS. I was not a secretary. I was not assigned to anybody in particular at RKO. My employment there was very short. I was in the stenographic department.

Mr. JACKSON. And at Paramount?

Miss WINTERS. I worked in the story department.

Mr. JACKSON. Under whose direction?

Miss WINTERS. William Dozier was then head of the story department, and I would say I presume it was for him that I worked, actually.

Mr. JACKSON. He was your immediate superior?

Miss WINTERS. No. Several people worked under him. A man named John Hanighan had direct charge of the story-files department, and for a time Meta Reis Rosenberg had that position and I worked for her.

Mr. JACKSON. Is that where you made the contact that later led to your employment at Berg-Allen Berg?

Miss WINTERS. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. I will say that the mention of these names should in no way be construed as a connotation of Communist affiliation. No further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you work for Berg-Allen Berg?

Miss WINTERS. As far as I remember, from 1945 to 1948 or 1949; I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Do you desire to retain this witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. GORENFELD. Do I understand the witness is excused?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. GORENFELD. Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. WOOD. The committee will stand at recess until 10:30 tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon, at 12:10 p. m., a recess was taken until Thursday, May 17, 1951, at 10:30 a. m.)





# COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION- PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 2

THURSDAY, MAY 17, 1951

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

## PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:40 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood (chairman), Francis E. Walter, Clyde Doyle, James B. Frazier, Jr., Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; John W. Carrington, clerk; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and A. S. Poore, editor.

Mr. WOOD. Let the committee come to order, and let the record show that there are present the following members of the committee: Mr. Walter, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, Mr. Velde, Mr. Kearney, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Potter, and Mr. Wood, a quorum of the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Lloyd Gough.

Mr. WOOD. Hold up your right hand, please. You solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. GOUGH. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat.

## TESTIMONY OF LLOYD GOUGH, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, MARTIN POPPER

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Lloyd Gough?

Mr. GOUGH. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you represented by counsel?

Mr. GOUGH. I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. POPPER. Martin Popper, 160 Broadway, New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Gough?

Mr. GOUGH. I was born in New York City during the panic of 1907.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. GOUGH. Well, being an actor I usually reside wherever I am. I do not have any permanent residence anywhere. Until I came to Washington I was residing in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. What address?

Mr. GOUGH. 2723 Laurel Canyon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state for the committee briefly your educational background, please, sir?

Mr. GOUGH. Well, my formal schooling was in the public and parochial schools in New York and Brooklyn, which I attended until I was 12 years old. That is the end of my formal schooling.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been the nature of your employment in your professional capacity?

Mr. GOUGH. Well, I went to work at the age of 12 in Wall Street for \$8 a week, and did a variety of other things until 1930, at which time I went into the theater. I have worked in summer stock and Broadway plays, road companies, et cetera. In 1946 I went to California, and in 1947 I began working in motion pictures.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you employed in the motion picture industry? That is, by whom were you employed?

Mr. GOUGH. Well, I have worked for several of the major studios and several of the so-called independent studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which were the studios for which you worked?

Mr. GOUGH. MGM, Twentieth Century-Fox, Universal; there seem to be some more in there, but I don't quite remember. Those were the major studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were some of the major pictures in which you took part?

Mr. GOUGH. Well; I just finished a picture called Chuck-a-luck. Prior to that I was in Valentino; before that in The Scarf; and a variety of others which I don't recall too clearly. I can remember Body and Soul; That Wonderful Urge; and Rivoli. I am sorry to be so slow. There are so many of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the producer of Body and Soul?

Mr. GOUGH. The producer was, I believe the name was Enterprise Film Productions, or some such thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who composed the organization that you referred to?

Mr. GOUGH. You mean the officers of the corporation?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, the owners.

Mr. GOUGH. Well, it is hard for me to say. I am an actor. We don't have much contact with the actual producers. There was—let's see. This is 6 years ago—5 years ago, I am sorry. I am sorry, I really can't tell offhand just who were the officials of the corporation, or the producers of the picture.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the director?

Mr. GOUGH. It is a matter of public record who directed any picture I was in.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, have you any objection to telling who the director was of the picture you were in?

Mr. GOUGH (after conferring with his counsel). This question puts me in the position of testifying against myself. Consequently, I would like your permission to invoke the privileges granted me under the fifth and first amendments. My answer to the question may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. WOOD. The committee cannot give you permission; you have the right to invoke the privilege, but you do not have the permission of the committee to do so. The committee wants the truth. If you

desire to invoke the privilege under the Constitution of the United States providing that a man in a criminal case may not be required to testify against himself, and if you think an answer to the question asked would so incriminate you in a criminal case, you have the right to claim the privilege, but don't give the impression that this committee will give you permission to claim it, because we do not have that authority.

Mr. GOUGH. That was an ambiguous phrase. I must decline to answer the question on the grounds as I stated them.

Mr. WOOD. Let me see if I understand you correctly. Do you claim that an answer as to who directed a picture that you appeared in and acted in, notwithstanding the fact you say it is a matter of public record, that to divulge that would tend to incriminate you in a criminal prosecution?

Mr. GOUGH. The specific picture that is under discussion, I am confident that for me to do anything but decline to answer the question would tend to incriminate me, and consequently I must invoke the privileges of the fifth and first amendments.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Who was the cameraman?

Mr. GOUGH. I am not sure, but I think it was James Wong Howe.

Mr. JACKSON. Who was the executive?

Mr. GOUGH. Mr. Jackson, you know that actors don't have too much contact with the executives of the corporation.

Mr. JACKSON. You don't know who had actual charge of the production?

Mr. GOUGH. There was a business manager, or I guess you could call him the production manager. I remember his name. It was Joseph Gilton.

Mr. JACKSON. Who did the script?

Mr. GOUGH. Excuse me. [After conferring with his counsel:] I am afraid I must decline to answer that question on the grounds I previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. Self-incrimination? In your mind you distinguish as between the cameraman and the script writer and director?

Mr. GOUGH. I am not sure of the name of the cameraman. [After conferring with his counsel:] And I feel that the committee here before which I am appearing has made this distinction.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee has made no distinction. You yourself have said that you are afraid you will incriminate yourself by answering these questions as to these individuals. That is a determination of your own. We haven't made that distinction at all. It is you, in your own mind, upon advice of counsel, who have made that distinction. I have no further questions at this time.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Who played the principal role in *Body and Soul*?

Mr. GOUGH. I am afraid I must decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Gough, were you present at the home of Karen Morley at the time an investigator of this committee appeared there to serve process for her appearance before this committee?

Mr. GOUGH. I must decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your presence at the home of Karen Morley, you contend, might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. GOUGH. Your pursuit of this line of inquiry, Mr. Tavenner, I believe tends to destroy the privilege I have just invoked.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where is Karen Morley today?

Mr. GOUGH. I must decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where she is?

Mr. GOUGH. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Gough, Miss Hazel Huffman, an investigator for the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, participated in certain activities of the American Peace Mobilization, and she testified before this committee in May 1941 that you attended a section of the American People's Meeting which met in Mecca Temple, New York City, on April 5, 1941, and that you were also present at Randall's Island, New York City, on that same day, at a meeting sponsored by the American Peace Mobilization. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. GOUGH. I am afraid I must decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. WOOD. Do you so decline?

Mr. GOUGH. I do decline to answer on the grounds I stated earlier.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Actors' Equity Association?

Mr. GOUGH. All actors in the theatre are required to belong to Actors' Equity Association.

Mr. WOOD. Do you mean by that, that you are a member of it?

Mr. GOUGH. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attempt to induce that association to send a delegation to Randall's Island to attend a meeting sponsored by the American Peace Mobilization?

Mr. GOUGH. I will decline to answer on the grounds stated earlier.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever affiliated with the Theater Arts Committee?

Mr. GOUGH. I must decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you treasurer of that organization? Just a moment. I hand you a sheet showing the members of the executive board of the Theater Arts Committee, a printed statement.

Mr. WOOD. Do you have a date?

Mr. TAVENNER. Bearing date December 1, 1939, in which the name appears, Lloyd Gough, under the title "Treasurer." Will you look at that and state whether or not you were treasurer of the organization at that time?

Mr. GOUGH (after examining document and conferring with his counsel). I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to state that you went to Hollywood in 1946?

Mr. GOUGH. That is right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. After your arrival in Hollywood, did you become chairman of the executive committee of the Actors' Laboratory?

Mr. GOUGH. I must decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.



MR. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated with the Progressive Citizens of America?

MR. GOUGH. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER. Your name appears as one of those on a brief amicus curiae filed with the Supreme Court of the United States in the case against Trumbo and Lawson. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which you permitted the use of your name on that brief, if you did authorize it to be done?

MR. GOUGH. I must decline to answer on the grounds I stated earlier, sir.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Gough, there has been testimony before this committee by Mr. Sterling Hayden and also by Mr. Marc Lawrence, the effect of which is that you attended certain Communist Party meetings at which each of them was present. Mr. Hayden testified that you attended several of the meetings that he attended, but he did not state that he definitely knew that you were a member of the Communist Party. I asked him this question:

Do you have any knowledge on your own part as to whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party?

referring to you, and Mr. Hayden answered:

Well, I would say it would probably be safe to assume that he was.

Then I said:

I don't want you to assume it.

And Mr. Hayden said:

I have absolutely, categorically, no knowledge that he was.

Did you attend Communist Party meetings with Mr. Hayden, or at which Mr. Hayden was present?

MR. GOUGH. I must decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

MR. WOOD. Mr. Gough, there is no compulsion on your part to decline. When you say you must decline, do you mean you do decline?

MR. GOUGH. I am sorry. I am giving it to you in too many words.

MR. WOOD. Do you decline?

MR. GOUGH. I do decline.

MR. WOOD. For the reasons you have previously stated?

MR. GOUGH. Yes; thank you.

MR. TAVENNER. In the course of the testimony of Mr. Marc Lawrence, when he was asked the names of persons who attended Communist Party meetings with him and who belonged to Communist cells to which he had been assigned, this question was asked:

Were there others whose names you can now recall?

MR. LAWRENCE. Well, there were kids at the lab that I don't recall, whose names I don't remember. They were also at the cell meetings. I don't remember them. This is what I do remember. This is actual. There was a meeting held at Karen Morley's house one night in which there was a kind of bunch of actors. Sterling Hayden was there. Larry Parks was there. They were discussing some big thing about what to do with the actors. There was a lot of fuss made at the time. And I remember Sterling and I remember Larry. I remember Anne Revere, Howard Da Silva, Lloyd Gough, and these people. That is what I do remember. Now, I don't know if these people were members of the Communist Party, but it was supposed to have been a closed cell. I couldn't identify these people.

Now, did you attend a meeting at the home of Karen Morley as described by Mr. Lawrence?

Mr. GOUGH (after conferring with his counsel). I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you living in Hollywood in 1947?

Mr. GOUGH. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In January of 1947 did you attend a meeting at the home of Waldo and Mary Salt which was attended also by Paul Perlin. P-e-r-l-i-n?

Mr. GOUGH. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GOUGH. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. GOUGH. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Gough, you refused to answer questions as to whether you were a member of the Theater Arts Committee. Why?

Mr. GOUGH. I feel that this question is merely a pursuit of the previous questions to which it refers.

Mr. WALTER. Have you ever been a member of that committee?

Mr. GOUGH. I must decline to answer the question on the grounds I stated previously.

Mr. WALTER. That committee is not listed as a Communist or Communist-front organization?

Mr. GOUGH. I believe it is, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Are you a member of the Elks?

Mr. GOUGH. I am sorry to say I am not.

Mr. WALTER. Are you a member of the Knights of Columbus?

Mr. GOUGH. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. What organizations do you belong to?

Mr. GOUGH. I decline to answer on the grounds I previously stated, the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. WALTER. You didn't hesitate a moment in answering the question as to whether or not you were a member of the Elks or of the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. GOUGH. It is my opinion, sir, my firm conviction, that I can be incriminated through membership in certain organizations and am free to belong to other organizations.

Mr. WALTER. What crime could you possibly be charged with if you were a member of the Theater Arts Committee?

Mr. GOUGH. I am sure my counsel could state this much more clearly than I could.

Mr. WALTER. After all, it is your answer. You declined to answer the question on the ground you felt it might tend to incriminate you. I am asking you what crime you feel you might be charged with if you were a member of that organization?

Mr. GOUGH (after conferring with his counsel). The Eighty-second and the Eighty-first Congresses, and previous Congresses, have both passed legislation which would tend to incriminate members of certain organizations.

Mr. WALTER. So that you feel that if you admitted that you belonged to that organization, you would subject yourself to prosecution?

Mr. GOUGH. Possible prosecution; yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Then is it fair for me to draw the inference that you do belong to this organization, and that is the reason why you won't answer the question?

Mr. GOUGH (after conferring with his counsel). As I understand the amendment I have invoked, for the committee or any member of the committee to draw any inference from my refusal to answer the questions on the grounds I stated certainly is a violation of my constitutional privileges.

Mr. WALTER. Don't you think that you are intimating that my constitutional privilege to draw that inference is being violated, when you make that statement?

Mr. GOUGH. As a public official I don't think you are privileged to inquire beyond my declination to answer. Were you sitting here, I think you would—I am sorry. (After conferring with his counsel :) I was about to say, as a private individual, of course you have that right.

Mr. WALTER. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. You spoke something about your rights. Don't you know that a witness before this committee really has more rights than a witness in a court of law as far as answering questions is concerned?

Mr. GOUGH. I don't know that the witness has any more rights here.

Mr. KEARNEY. What I have in mind is this—and I think counsel this time will agree with me—that in a court of law if you are on the witness stand you don't have the opportunity of consulting your counsel on every question asked you. Here you do.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KEARNEY. You don't need to answer that.

Mr. GOUGH. Thank you very much.

Mr. KARNEY. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. I have no questions, only one comment bearing on Mr. Walter's statement. I would like to point out that a great horse, Man O' War, got a great reputation because he was seen around stables and races so much, and if the analogy is not clear, I will say I personally come to the same conclusion as Mr. Walter so far as your membership is concerned. That is all.

Mr. GOUGH. May I comment, too, sir?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. GOUGH. I have traveled around this country a great deal in a variety of forms of accommodations, and anyone with whom I have associated has been American.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions, Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. In line with contributions which you may have made, have you ever contributed to the Community Chest?

Mr. GOUGH. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever contributed to Red Cross?

Mr. GOUGH. Yes, sir.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever contributed to Actors' Laboratory?

Mr. GOUGH. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever contributed to the Communist Party?

Mr. GOUGH. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

May I say something about contributions?

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Gough, I failed to get your age. How old are you?

Mr. GOUGH. I will be 44 in September.

Mr. POTTER. Were you in the armed services during the war?

Mr. GOUGH. Yes, sir; in France, Belgium, and Germany.

Mr. POTTER. Would you serve the United States if you were called?

Mr. GOUGH. Right now?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. GOUGH. Well, Mr. Potter, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Republican leader in the Senate, and Mr. Ernest T. Weir, chairman of the board of directors of National Steel Corp., have all said we won't be ready to launch a war for approximately 2 years. It seems to me you are pushing me into the firing line somewhat prematurely.

Mr. POTTER. I am asking you whether, if you were called, the same as a lot of men are being called, would you serve?

Mr. GOUGH. I am a law-abiding citizen, and if there is a law in this country that I can be called to serve in the Army I would simply repeat the process in World War II, the war against fascism.

Mr. POTTER. In other words, you would fight against communism the same as you fought against fascism?

Mr. GOUGH. I would certainly have to go if I were called, or violate the law.

Mr. POTTER. And you would do so?

Mr. GOUGH. I would not violate the law.

Mr. POTTER. You would carry out your obligations as a citizen and fight against communism if you were so called?

Mr. GOUGH. I think we have decided the nature of the war a little too soon.

Mr. POTTER. You brought it up. You said you fought against fascism in the last war.

Mr. GOUGH. I said I would go in the Army. You are asking what I would fight against.

Mr. POTTER. Yes, I would like to know if you would be on our side or on the other side. You refuse to answer categorically whether you would fight against communism if you were called.

Mr. GOUGH. I said I would go in the United States Army. I think that answers the question.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. There is a vote and we will have to recess for 35 minutes. (Short recess.)



Mr. TAVENNER. I have been authorized by the chairman to announce that because of pressing business on the floor of the House the hearing will be adjourned until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

(Thereupon, at 11:40 a. m., a recess was taken until 2 p. m. of the same day.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. WOOD. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that there are present the following members of the committee: Mr. Walter, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Kearney, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Potter, and Mr. Wood, a quorum of the committee.

Mr. POPPER. This morning, as a result of a roll call, there was no announcement by the chairman formally excusing Mr. Gough.

Mr. WOOD. Do we have any reason to detain him further, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. He may be excused.

Mr. POPPER. May I place in the record a statement?

Mr. WOOD. It will be received and filed with the committee.

(The statement referred to is on file with the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call Mr. Thad Page.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Page, will you hold up your right hand, please. Do you solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. PAGE. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat.

#### TESTIMONY OF THAD PAGE

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Page, your name is Mr. Thad Page?

Mr. PAGE. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you are a representative from the National Archives staff?

Mr. PAGE. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. A subpoena duces tecum has been issued for the production of a document in the custody of your department. You are now responding to that subpoena, are you?

Mr. PAGE. That is right, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have the document with you?

Mr. PAGE. I do, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you let me see it?

Mr. PAGE (producing folder). It is the white document in that folder.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, this is Form 57 purportedly signed by Mr. Leonardo Bercovici. I do not want to introduce this in evidence, but the witness will have to take it back unless we have a photostatic copy made at once. I think, if we just let him present it, that will be satisfactory for our purposes, and I can return it to him in a few minutes. I was not going to introduce it as an exhibit.

Mr. WOOD. Do you want to have it photostated?

Mr. TAVENNER. If the chairman thinks we should, we will have it photostated, but we will have to get it back at once.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Tavenner, we could, within an hour or so, provide you with a photostatic copy.

Mr. WOOD. I was just going to ask if you had facilities to do that.

Mr. PAGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the document and state exactly what it is?

Mr. PAGE. This is a folder from the Office of War Information that was transferred to the National Archives, and the folder is labeled "Mr. Leonardo Bercovici"—if that is the proper pronunciation—and among the documents in the folder is Standard Government Form No. 57, purportedly signed by Mr. Bercovici, in which he sets forth various information called for in connection with an application for employment by the Office of War Information.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Any questions, gentlemen?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, may I ask this: How long has that folder been in your possession in the Archives?

Mr. PAGE. I can't give you the exact date, Mr. Doyle. The records are not under my immediate supervision, but they were transferred within at least a year and a half after the close of activities in the Second World War.

Mr. DOYLE. And it has been continuously in the possession of the Archives since that time?

Mr. PAGE. That is right.

Mr. WOOD. And was transferred to your department by the Office of War Information?

Mr. PAGE. That is right; yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Very well. There being no further questions, the witness will be excused, and we would appreciate it if you would furnish us with a photostat of that document as quickly as you can.

Mr. PAGE. As soon as I can, I will, sir.

(Witness excused.)

(Representative Harold H. Velde entered the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I call Mr. Leonardo Bercovici.

#### TESTIMONY OF LEONARDO BERCOVICI, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, EUGENE GRESSMAN—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. You have previously been sworn, Mr. Bercovici. I hand you Form 57 just presented by a representative of the National Archives staff, purportedly signed by you. Will you examine that, please, and state whether or not that is your signature at the end of it?

Mr. BERCOVICI (after examining document). Yes, Mr. Tavenner, that would appear to be my signature.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you look at paragraph 17 and read it into the record, please?

Mr. VELDE. Just a moment, Mr. Tavenner. He said it would appear to be his signature. Is it your signature?

Mr. BERCOVICI. As far as I know that is my signature.

Mr. VELDE. What do you mean by as far as you know?

Mr. BERCOVICI. Yes, it is my signature.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read section 17? Read it aloud into the record.

Mr. BERCOVICI (reading) :

Do you advocate or have you ever advocated or are you now or have you ever been a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence? If so, give complete details under item 45.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your answer to that question, "yes" or "no"?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What answer appears on your form above your signature?

Mr. BERCOVICI. The answer is "No" as written on this document.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that answer truthful?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer on the ground that it may tend to incriminate or degrade me and it violates my privileges under the Constitution, and especially under the fifth and first amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you let me see the form again? The date of this application for employment with the OWI is June 10, 1943. On that date were you a member or had you been a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence?

Mr. BERCOVICI. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Kearney.

Mr. KEARNEY. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. No questions.

Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason to detain this witness further?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. You may be excused.

Mr. BERCOVICI. Thank you very much.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Roy M. Brewer, please.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Brewer, will you stand and be sworn, please? You solemnly swear the evidence you give this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BREWER. I do.

Mr. WOOD. Have a seat.

#### TESTIMONY OF ROY M. BREWER

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Roy M. Brewer?

Mr. BREWER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. BREWER. I was born in Hall County, Nebr., August 9, 1909.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation?

Mr. BREWER. I am international representative of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees assigned to the Hollywood motion picture studios.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where is your place of residence?

Mr. BREWER. 716 North Curson Avenue, Los Angeles 46, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee, please, a brief statement of your educational training?

Mr. BREWER. I graduated from Grand Island, Nebr., high school in 1926. I had previously completed grammar school. I went one semester to the Grand Island Baptist College. That has been the extent of my education.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your employment record since your work in college?

Mr. BREWER. I went to work in a theater and worked in a theater for a period of about 10 years, but during one period between 1933 and 1934 I worked for the Government as labor compliance officer of the National Recovery Administration for the State of Nebraska.

Then in 1937 I was elected president of the Nebraska State Federation of Labor, which is the State branch of the American Federation of Labor. I occupied that position until 1943, when I went to work for the Government with the War Production Board in Washington, where I worked until 1945, when I accepted my present position with the International Alliance.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you begin your work in California?

Mr. BREWER. I made one brief trip out there—I was on leave for a brief period—I made one brief trip there in late 1944 just before I left the War Production Board and went to my present occupation. That was my first visit to California studios. The second time was March 12, 1945. I arrived there about noon that day. That was the day the first Hollywood strike had started.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you have been engaged in work in connection with labor organizations since that date?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And in Hollywood?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Brewer, Mr. Dmytryk and Mr. Collins, in the course of their testimony before this committee, described the general aims and purposes of the Communist Party in Hollywood. Their testimony related chiefly to what have been called the talent guilds. Each of them indicated that there were others better able to advise the committee concerning Communist activity in the labor unions as distinguished from the talent guilds. Because of your long experience with labor unions in Hollywood we want to develop this information fully through your testimony.

I would like to make it plain at the outset that the committee is not undertaking to investigate internal disputes within the labor unions. Our inquiry is limited solely to an investigation of the extent, character, and objectives of Communist infiltration of the motion picture industry, either through labor organizations, other organizations, or individuals.

Preliminary to questioning you relating to these matters, I would like for you to describe to the committee what the over-all organiza-



tional set-up of labor was in Hollywood in the late thirties and early forties.

MR. BREWER. Well, the Hollywood motion picture industry has had a rather turbulent labor history. In 1938 the organization which I represent had in its organization most of the mechanical crafts that have to do with the production of motion pictures. That is, we had the cameramen, the property craftsmen, what we call the grips, the costumers, the make-up artists, and most all of the skilled crafts that worked with the shooting companies on a motion picture set, as well as some of the men who prepared the sets and built the properties for the studios. We were a branch of the American Federation of Labor, that had historically embraced in its membership the amusement industry.

Then there existed a local union of teamsters, a local union of plasterers, a local union of carpenters, all affiliated with the appropriate international of the American Federation of Labor that embraces those crafts along other lines.

There was a local union of common laborers or building laborers, and later on there was an organization of office workers. That is quite a story in itself.

Then in addition to that there were the talent guilds, which performed some of the functions of a union, but because they were composed of professionals instead of so-called laboring groups, they were in a different category, and most of them were independent with the exception of the Screen Actors' Guild, which was an affiliate of the Four A's, which is in turn an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor.

Generally speaking, that is the structure.

MR. TAVENNER. And what was your exact position in your particular union?

MR. BREWER. My position was the international representative. I represented the national office of the local unions which existed in Hollywood. In other words, my job was to coordinate the activities of the various local unions which embraced the different crafts in our organization.

MR. TAVENNER. What is the official name of the union?

MR. BREWER. International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of the United States and Canada is the official name.

MR. TAVENNER. In order not to have to repeat that name, what are the initials by which it is known?

MR. BREWER. IATSE or, shorter, IA.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the membership of that organization when you went to California?

MR. BREWER. Approximately 60,000 nationally, with between 15,000 and 17,000 of those in Hollywood.

MR. TAVENNER. As a result of your experience in connection with your work in Hollywood, do you consider that you are in a position to give information to this committee regarding the general over-all purposes of the Communist Party and its efforts to infiltrate Hollywood, particularly from the labor union side?

MR. BREWER. Well, I made it my business to find out, because it was such an important factor, and I think I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for you to state in your own way to the committee what those over-all purposes of the Communist Party were from your experience, and what means they adopted to accomplish their purposes.

Mr. BREWER. I will be very happy to.

I would like to say, if I may, at the outset, that as this story unfolds you will see, at least from my standpoint, that the Communist Party in Hollywood at a certain point developed a tremendous and powerful degree of control in the Hollywood community, not only in the labor unions but in the community itself, and in order that there might not be any misunderstanding, I want to make it clear that this extensive control does not exist in Hollywood today.

The Hollywood strike of 1946 and the subsequent hearings of this committee in 1947 did a great deal to awaken the people of that community to this menace, and since that time their influence has declined. There still are a lot of them around, as this committee is proving, and we feel this committee is doing a great service in ferreting them out, but the back of their power that they had in 1945 and 1946, so far as its influence over the community is concerned, has been broken.

I wanted to make that clear so that my story may not be misinterpreted.

Mr. TAVENNER. By referring to the Communist Party, were you speaking of it principally as an open organization at that time as distinguished from underground activities at this particular time, at the present time?

Mr. BREWER. Well, of course, the real power that they had in Hollywood was through their front organizations. The strength of the underground organization probably is as great today as it was then. It has been hurt some. But so far as the front organizations with which they dominated the thought and life of the community, they have been affected by the activities that have transpired.

Mr. VELDE. You mentioned that the hearings in 1947 of communism in Hollywood dampened the enthusiasm for the Hollywood Communist movement?

Mr. BREWER. It did more than that. It shocked the community in a way that is hard to describe. As one of that small group that had been trying to make the community aware of what was going on I was cognizant of the problem we had in convincing the community of what was taking place under their noses and the community did not believe it. But when the hearings in 1947 took place and these individuals conducted themselves in the manner they did, it hit Hollywood like a broad slap in the face, and they began to take a new look, and since that time the Communist movement there has been pretty much on the defensive.

Mr. VELDE. You don't mean to say the hearings in 1947 completely exposed all the Communist Party members? At that time there were only a dozen or so that were identified as members of the Communist Party, and during these past hearings we have probably identified as many as 50; I don't know the exact number.

Mr. TAVENNER. Ninety.

Mr. VELDE. Ninety. I would like your comment on that.

Mr. BREWER. The point I want to make is that the average person in Hollywood did not believe the stories of Communist infiltration be-

fore the 1947 hearings. Since that time they have become aware of the menace and have been trying to help clean them up. Before that they were just ignoring them and were indifferent to them.

Mr. VELDE. Do you feel that there were as many Communists in Hollywood in 1947 as there are at the present time, but that they probably were not all identified at that time?

Mr. BREWER. Oh, yes. I think the underground organization that is being exposed by this committee is completing the job which was only started by the 1947 hearings. But the real point I want to make is, it was the ordinary citizen that became awakened in 1947, the fellow who was not a Communist but who was completely indifferent to the efforts that had been made to expose them.

Mr. VELDE. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe my question was to this general effect, that I would like for you to tell the committee in your own way just what the objects and purposes, from your experience, were of the Communist Party in infiltrating Hollywood from the labor angle, and to develop, as you can, the methods used by the Communist Party to accomplish their main objectives.

Mr. BREWER. Well, I think first of all that the effort to infiltrate and control the labor unions was a part of the total plan. I think there were separate parts of the plan, but I think there was an over-all plan, and that their effort to infiltrate and control labor was definitely a part of that plan.

As to their motives, I think without a doubt the principal motive of the Communist Party was to use the motion-picture industry for propaganda purposes. They realized that was the area in which it was supreme. There was no industry in the world that had the influence over the mass thinking of the people of the world, particularly the western world, that this industry had.

I think there can be no real doubt but that the ultimate goal of the Communist Party was to control the motion-picture industry for purposes of propaganda. You will see that they praised it as a progressive industry up to a point, and that point was until 1947, when they began to change and to brand it as an agent of the imperialistic United States.

So, there can be no doubt, in my opinion, but that the goal was to control the content of films. I have an editorial in my possession which was published since Mr. Dmytryk's testimony which I think is indicative of the fact that that was their motive. They attack Mr. Dmytryk and say he is now free to make the frivolous kind of films that the industry is known for, and he will no longer be able to turn out the type he used to.

There were many byproducts of this. One was influencing the motion-picture industry itself, and in some of the communications published as far back as 1938 we have evidence of the fact that they felt the Hollywood unions in themselves would be a powerful stimulus toward the development of an industrial union in the United States, which the Communist Party was pressing.

There was the prestige they got out of being able to call upon the stars and personalities of the motion-picture industry. That was another byproduct of their program.



Then there was the question of funds. There have been tremendous sums of money supplied not only to the Communist Party but to activities they were directing behind the scenes, and much of the money was used, some directly and some indirectly, for the work of the Communist Party.

Then there was another factor which is very significant, and that is the political power which they were able to maneuver. They were able to get behind the scenes of labor groups and political groups, and by their careful maneuvering and use of the fraction and techniques of dominating mass organizations, they were able to make decisions which the mass organizations and political organizations carried out. They wielded tremendous political power in California at the height of their power. I think that was a very important factor.

Now as to the plan. The plan was, in my judgment, a very carefully laid out one, and one which came directly from the Soviet Union. I have evidence which is in the form of testimony given before the State committee in California that this plan, along with plans for other activity on the west coast, was laid out and financed by eight agents of the Soviet Union.

One individual was a man named Michael Aisenstein.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you spell the name, please?

MR. BREWER. If I may refer to my notes. [After referring to notes.] It is A-i-s-e-n-s-t-e-i-n, Michael Aisenstein. He is identified as participating in meetings in Carmel and San Francisco in the years 1934 and 1935, and at that time he was Commissar for Heavy Industries of the U. S. S. R. and the Pacific coast representative of Amtorg Corp.

According to this testimony, Mr. Aisenstein and the Soviet consul, an individual by the name of Galkovich—

MR. TAVENNER. Will you spell that name?

MR. BREWER. G-a-l-k-o-v-i-c-h—were active, and two of the people with whom these people were identified are Ella Winter, who was the wife of Lincoln Steffens and is now the wife of Donald Ogden Stewart—

MR. TAVENNER. You are speaking a little too rapidly.

MR. BREWER. I am sorry. This evidence indicates that money and material were furnished by these two individuals, Ella Winter and Albert Rhys Williams. This material was sent to Hollywood, and one to whom it was sent was Jeff Kibre.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you spell that name?

MR. BREWER. J-e-f-f K-i-b-r-e.

MR. TAVENNER. You are speaking of the record of testimony showing these various things. I would like for you to identify a little more specifically the record to which you refer.

MR. BREWER. This record is a record which was made before the California Committee on Un-American Activities. It was made in the latter part of 1944 or 1945, and certified copies of this record are available and can be had by this committee, I am sure. This record was made pursuant to an investigation they made, and the testimony was given by an individual named Charles Bakesy, B-a-k-e-s-y.

MR. TAVENNER. And you have the record of that testimony before you?

MR. BREWER. Yes.



Mr. TAVENNER. And you are giving a synopsis of that testimony?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. I have a complete copy of his testimony before me as it was given before that committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were speaking of an individual by the name of Kibre.

Mr. BREWER. Yes. One of the individuals who received information and funds was Jeff Kibre. Jeff Kibre has quite a history in Hollywood, and he has a subsequent history also. He appeared in 1937 as a member of one of our unions, and eventually became the leader of a group called the IA Progressives.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the name of that?

Mr. BREWER. IA Progressives. IA is an abbreviation of IATSE.

Mr. TAVENNER. You had better give the entire abbreviation.

Mr. BREWER. He came into prominence first as leader of the IATSE Progressives, which was a group within the IATSE trying to influence the leadership of that organization, and in due course this group did capture the control of this organization, which was at that time known as local No. 37 of the IATSE, and which embraced approximately 9,000 of the back-lot workers on the Hollywood studio lots.

There were charges and countercharges at that time.

Mr. POTTER. What time was that?

Mr. BREWER. This was 1937. One of the actions which took place was a result of the difficulties which the international union was having with this local union as a result of the IA Progressives. The international came in and revoked the charter of that local and set up the craft local union. They seemed to feel that this local union was too large, and maybe that was the reason for the trouble.

As a result of that, Mr. Kibre then came out in the open and tried to form another organization. We have a very important history of reports which Mr. Kibre wrote. In these reports he outlined the plan, and as a result of these reports we find that Mr. Kibre was acting in a dual capacity. In addition to being an agent of the Communist Party he was also posing as a field representative of the CIO.

Now, the CIO at that time in California was completely controlled by Communist groups. The main part of their organization in the northern part of the State was the Longshoremen's Union, under Mr. Bridges; and in Los Angeles the leader of the CIO was Mr. Philip Connelly.

I think I need not identify Mr. Bridges and his record, but Mr. Philip Connelly is now editor of the People's World, the west-coast Communist publication, so I think there can be no question of a doubt but what the CIO was virtually synonymous with the Communist Party on the Pacific coast at that particular period.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was when?

Mr. BREWER. In 1937 and 1938.

Mr. Kibre, in writing his reports—which have come into our possession and which are more or less common knowledge in Hollywood since 1939, but which probably were not appraised in their full significance—Mr. Kibre outlines quite clearly what his plan was and what many of his motives were, and I can briefly sketch from these reports a few of the pertinent points.

Mr. DOYLE. Will the witness identify the reports?

Mr. BREWER. These are reports written by Mr. Kibre in the latter part of 1937 and in 1938, and some of them are to CIO headquarters, and some of them are to Communist Party functionaries.

The first one which I have here, which is quite significant, was written to Mr. Louis Goldblatt. Mr. Louis Goldblatt at that time, I believe, was secretary of the State branch of the CIO. In any event, he is a close associate of Mr. Bridges and served for some time as secretary of the Longshoremen's Union on the Pacific coast.

Here are some of the pertinent points Mr. Kibre wrote Mr. Goldblatt in November 1938:

1. IMPORTANCE OF HOLLYWOOD. The political campaign has clearly demonstrated the strategical importance of Hollywood. Hardly anyone will question the fact that Hollywood was a dominant factor in the campaign. Olsen, for example, credits the Motion-Picture Democratic Committee with being the most potent force in the entire campaign. Obviously, the potency of Hollywood as a public force need not be confined to the political field. It can be just as effective on the trade-union front. Developments in Hollywood can have decisive influence on the trade-union situation in California—and nationally. And, further, a well-organized and ably functioning union in Hollywood can easily become a national example. Thus, Hollywood deserves careful consideration in any estimate of general perspective with regard to the pushing of industrial unionism.

In the report he proceeds to outline the program by which he hopes to take over the labor movement in Hollywood. There are two things that are predominant in all these reports. One of them is that the enemies of the Communist Party were the IATSE and the Screen Actors' Guild; and in almost every report which he writes—and I will leave copies of these full reports with the committee—he is trying to maneuver it so as to smash the IATSE and the Screen Actors' Guild.

(Representative Harold H. Velde left hearing room.)

Mr. BREWER (continuing). There are other significant matters in these reports. One is that they have organized various of these guilds and that their agents are in control of all the activities taking place; that is, all the dissension, all the disruption, all the public activity is the work of their agents.

Here is a very pertinent paragraph—and I am trying to pick out the most important ones to save the time of the committee:

Our work has been entirely through the existing organizations. Experience has proven this the only realistic method of crystallizing sentiment for industrial unionism. The attempts of a "Red" Larkin (Who has apparently been in communication with the national office of the CIO) to horn in on the organization of an industrial union demonstrates the utter futility of working from the outside.

Larkin's mass base consists of a few dozen ragtail elements who have dropped out of the existing unions. His connection to the present situation was evidenced 2 weeks ago when he feverishly wired Mr. Lewis with the statement he could swing the industry CIO if given a charter. Larkin had reference to a meeting called by the Screen Writers' Guild of other unions and guilds with respect to jurisdictional claims of the IA. Since this meeting had been inspired by our contacts, promoted by us—

and here is a phrase which has shocked some of the members of the Screen Writers' Guild:

discussed an agenda prepared by me—

now that that was the Screen Writers' Guild calling the meeting, and yet he says the agenda was prepared by him—

it is highly possible Mr. Larkin did not know whereof he was barking. As a matter of fact, Mr. Larkin, with a dozen charters in hand, would not even have gained admittance to the meeting—as contrasted to the fact our contacts are the active agents of practically every event occurring at the present time.

Now, what Mr. Kibre outlined that he was trying to do was to form into a coalition the crafts and guilds in Hollywood and thereby establish a demand for an industrial basis, and to transfer the loyalty of these men from their national and international unions, which were American Federation of Labor unions and which were anti-Communist, to this group in Hollywood, so that they could eventually throw them into an industrial union and put them in the CIO.

He proceeded in that direction, and he got a break in the form of a decision from the National Labor Relations Board. This is significant too, because there was quite a lot of activity on the part of representatives of the National Labor Relations Board in this group.

Anyway, Mr. Kibre got a decision from the National Labor Relations Board which caused him to think the time was then right—this was early 1939—to press for an election to try to capture the unions in one swoop through an election. He got the decision. An election was called. And it was just prior to the election that these reports were found and made public, and it is partly because of these reports and partly through the basic loyalty of members of the American Federation of Labor that he was defeated by approximately 2 to 1. This was 1939.

Then, as you know, the Browne-Bioff scandal broke in Hollywood. They were members of our union, and charges of racketeering had been thrown around, and eventually it was established that Browne and Bioff were racketeers, and they were deposed.

In the wake of that scandal there appeared a vacuum, and men who had been trying to beat off the Communist movement were almost helpless. It was difficult to determine as to which of these individuals were honestly opposing the dishonest element and which were Communists. So, it proved to be a boon to the Communists in discrediting all the talk that had been built up about Communist infiltration.

In the course of it the Conference of Studio Unions appeared. In 1941 the Conference of Studio Unions was formed, and Mr. Herbert K. Sorrell was elected president of that organization.

A very significant fact then began to emerge.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I interrupt just a moment? You were telling us a few moments ago about Mr. Kibre and his record. I believe you have not completed that?

Mr. BREWER. No; I have not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you propose to return to him a little later in your testimony?

Mr. BREWER. I will now. At this point Kibre went out of the picture. I will go back and give you some of the information we have.

The report I read from before was a report made to the CIO. A little before that Mr. Kibre also made a report to a Communist official in New York City. He wrote a letter to Mr. Bob Reed. Mr. Bob Reed has been identified as one of the leaders of the Communist group in Actors' Equity in New York. He was referred to by Mr. Budenz in his book on page 220, and has been known around New York.



The letter is dated February 9. The year is not stated, but the year has been established as 1938. He starts out:

BOB REED,

*136 West Thirtieth Street, New York City.*

MY DEAR BOB: Well, one thing about Reds—they seldom write except on business.

And he goes on to describe the program in Hollywood which I have outlined. A very significant point appears in this letter, and that is, he attempts to stimulate some interest on the part of the national officers of the Communist Party toward setting up a national faction in the IATSE. He points out that, in their effort to capture Hollywood, the threat of a strike if they attempt to grab control in Hollywood is a very serious thing.

At that time the theaters throughout the Nation were owned by the same companies that owned the studios, so the almost complete control which our union had in the theaters throughout the Nation was a very potent threat to the efforts of the Communists to get control of Hollywood. So he was trying to get a national faction so that if a strike occurred in Hollywood they could neutralize this action by having key local unions throughout the United States that would protect their people. He mentions in this letter that Bob Reed should see Jack Stachel. He says:

In the meantime, I wish you would discuss matter if IA action with Jack Stachel, necessity of my getting in touch with contacts in the various cities, and so forth. I've taken it up with Paul Kline—

Paul Kline was a State official of the Communist Party in Hollywood—

but he feels personal appeal by you or V. J., rather than communication through official channels, would get quicker results.

At that point V. J. had not been identified when this letter was made public, but since that time it has been established without doubt that V. J. meant V. J. Jerome.

I have a photostatic copy of this letter with me, with the signature of Kibre on it, signed "Jeff." It is only signed in his first name, but we have it as he typed it. He typed it, apparently, on his own typewriter, because there are places crossed out. He closed this letter by saying, "Comradely, Jeff."

Another pertinent report in these reports involving Mr. Kibre was a report regarding an individual that appeared during the 1945 strike in Hollywood by the name of Irving Henschel.

(Representative Harold H. Velde returned.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. BREWER. H-e-n-s-c-h-e-l. Irving Henschel was leader of the Communist faction in 1944 and was a member of the Rank and File Committee which attempted to set up a revolt in our organization during the 1945 strike in Hollywood.

It appears that Mr. Henschel went to the 1938 convention of our International Alliance in Cleveland, and he went there as an appointed delegate, and one of the things he had to do was to present a resolution in an effort to present the views of the so-called IA Progressives in Hollywood.



He had a very difficult time there, because the sentiment was not very friendly. In the course of his activities he contacted a Communist Party official in Ohio by the name of Max Weiss, and apparently Max Weiss was not impressed by the manner in which Henschel handled himself, so he wrote a long report to Roy Hudson in New York.

MR. TAVENNER. Is that the same Roy Hudson who has been referred to frequently before this committee as a party functionary in western Pennsylvania, do you know?

MR. BREWER. Undoubtedly this is the same Roy Hudson. This communication is addressed to Comrade Lambert.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you know Lambert's first name?

MR. BREWER. Walter Lambert. And it is signed, "Comradely yours, Roy Hudson." In Mr. Weiss' report he makes criticisms of the way Henschel conducted himself.

MR. WALTER. How do you know Henschel was a Communist?

MR. BREWER. We have a report a little later on that identifies him as a Communist. In the first place, the report of Mr. Weiss itself identifies him as Communist Party member, and points out that perhaps he is not too reliable a member of the organization and should be investigated.

What Mr. Hudson asked Mr. Lambert to do was read Mr. Max Weiss' report and then investigate the situation in California to see if the complaints were justified.

This communication apparently was turned over to Mr. Kibre by Mr. Lambert, and Mr. Kibre then wrote a report, presumably to Lambert again, and here is the language of this report:

MR. VELDE. Will you identify Mr. Lambert?

MR. BREWER. He was State trade-union secretary of the Communist Party of California at that time.

MR. VELDE. Where were his headquarters?

MR. BREWER. San Francisco.

MR. VELDE. Was that Rudy Lambert?

MR. BREWER. Walter Lambert.

MR. WALTER. How does Weiss spell his name?

MR. BREWER. W-e-i-s-s. There is evidence that Weiss was at that time a Communist Party functionary in Ohio.

Here is what Mr. Kibre writes in his investigation of Mr. Henschel. After the preliminaries he says:

The following conclusions were reached:

1. That the differences of opinion with respect to the resolution, approach to the IA, and so forth, grows out of a thorough lack of understanding by the comrades in the East of the role of the IATSE in the motion-picture industry, the problems of the industry, and, consequently, of our basic line. This lack of understanding is also apparently wedded to a gross underestimation of the motion-picture industry as the foundation of the amusement industry.

2. That we affirm our confidence in comrade Irv Henschel, who is a party member of 3 years' standing in the industry; and further states that Comrade Henschel, despite numerous mistakes, attempted to the best of his ability to carry out the instructions of the local party organization; and, finally, that most of his mistakes were the product of the tremendous pressure and intimidation exerted upon him by the IA officials, plus the lack of proper party guidance and counsel in Cleveland.

And then he winds up by attacking the findings of Weiss and emphasizing that the real problem is the lack of a national faction in the

IATSE; and he refers in this to his communication to Bob Reed, indirectly. I will read this one paragraph:

As far as communication, etc. As far back as last fall we suggested the necessity of a national faction. Subsequently, I wrote to various contacts in New York, but received no answer. In February—

and that was the date of the Bob Reed letter—

I sent a more urgent plea, through the secretary of the actors' faction in New York, to Comrade Stachel. No answer was forthcoming. In addition, I urged Comrade Bob Kaye to secure IA contacts and put them in touch with me. There were no results. Certainly we welcome a national faction.

Mr. KEARNEY. May I interrupt, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is that Comrade Stachel you refer to one of the attorneys that represented the 11 Communists in New York a few months ago?

Mr. BREWER. I don't think he is an attorney. I think he has been identified as a national functionary of the Communist Party.

Mr. KEARNEY. He was one of the defendants.

Mr. BREWER. One of the defendants; yes.

So, with the publication of these reports, the election was won by the A. F. of L. unions and Mr. Kibre then faded out of the Hollywood picture. He reappeared in connection with the Englewood strike in 1940, when troops were sent to break the strike at the North American Aviation plant which President Roosevelt charged was a politically inspired strike. He is at present an official of the CIO fishermen's union on the Pacific coast, and he was indicted about 3 years ago, along with others, for violation of antitrust laws in connection with the fixing of prices of fish on the west coast.

In the transcript which I have here and which I will leave with the committee, there is further evidence of Kibre's membership in the party. There is an affidavit in the record of the committee signed by Ezra Chase, who testified he knew Jeff Kibre as a Communist. There is also testimony given by Lew Blix, business agent of the union at that time, that he had seen the Communist Party card of Jeff Kibre and that he was registered as Barry Wood. And also in the record is a copy of minutes of a particular Communist Party meeting in which the name Barry Wood appears as one of the participants.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the full name of Blix?

Mr. BREWER. Lew Blix, L-e-w B-l-i-x. He was business agent of local 37 in Hollywood for many, many years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before you leave Mr. Kibre, did he attempt to organize an organization or group known as the Unemployment Conference?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; he did. The first effort which he made at this so-called unity of the groups in Hollywood was through the form of an unemployment conference. At that time there was a great deal of unemployment in the motion-picture industry, and there were a great many men out of work, and he outlines in detail in this report how he intended to exploit this unemployment, as well as the jurisdictional problems, in order to create dissatisfaction among the union members with their local unions, and thereby stimulate interest for the industrial type of organization, which would be the CIO.

There is evidence also that in the election proceedings of 1938 funds were supplied by the State CIO for that purpose, although openly they did not campaign as a CIO affiliate.

There are references in this report that, if you would delete the word "unemployment," it would read almost like what was happening in 1945 and 1946 under the title "Conference of Studio Unions." Here is one paragraph in an early report:

Organizations remaining in the conference included: Studio painters; machinists cinema lodge; plasterers and modelers; utility employees; screen directors' guild; studio carpenters; studio electricians (IBEW); screen writers' guild; screen set designers; screen cartoonists' guild; screen publishers' guild; musicians and IA progressives. Excluding the latter group, over 10,000 studio workers were officially represented.

Of course the studio painters was the center of the conference of studio unions in later years. The screen set designers was a part of it. The carpenters' union was part of it. So that they had the same group. Some had broken away from them, but the pattern Kibre outlined in his early reports was exactly the pattern followed in the organization of the conference of studio unions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you return to the conference of studio unions?

Mr. BREWER. Out of this chaos that was left in the wake of the conviction of Browne and Bioff came the organization of the Conference of Studio Unions, of which Herbert K. Sorrell was president.

In 1940 one of the important unions in our international had had a change of officers. That was the laboratory technicians. At that time there were elected as its officers three individuals who later appeared very prominently in the activities that took place. The principal individual was Norvel Crutcher.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell it.

Mr. BREWER. N-o-r-v-e-l C-r-u-t-c-h-e-r.

Another individual was Russell McKnight, president; and John Martin was business agent.

Although all indications were that the Conference of Studio Unions was being organized as an organization to compete with the IATSE, this local union was one of the principal groups that helped organize the Conference. The first secretary of the Conference of Studio Unions was Mr. McKnight, who was president of this local union. The organizational activities of the Conference of Studio Unions in the early period took place in the offices of local 683.

I have in my possession, although I do not have them with me, a complete set of minutes of the Conference of Studio Unions from the day it was formed until August 1944, when local 683 withdrew. During this period the Conference of Studio Unions began to pick up the same program that had been carried on in the early stages against IATSE. They raised the cry they wanted autonomy, and they generally took a position that was contrary to the position of the American Federation of Labor on matters which involved any pro-Communist activities. In other words, they supported the position of the American Federation of Labor so far as it did not conflict with the Communist Party line, but whenever there was conflict, they were invariably on the side of the Communist Party. They passed resolutions to support Mr. Bridges and the CIO at a time the American Federation of Labor was fighting them. All these activities can be traced in this set of minutes.



Another individual who appeared on the scene was an individual named Pomerance.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell it?

Mr. BREWER. P-o-m-e-r-a-n-c-e, William. He had been the field examiner for the National Labor Relations Board at the time the election proceeding was held which determined the issue of representation in 1939, and I understand he had been discharged—no, I am sorry; I am not sure he was discharged. In any event, he left the National Labor Relations Board as an examiner and became employed, at the behest of Mr. Sorrell, I am told, as secretary of the Screen Cartoonists' Guild about the time of the Disney strike.

You will find in Walt Disney's testimony in 1947 that Mr. Sorrell placed Mr. Pomerance in charge of the Screen Cartoonists' Guild and later Pomerance went as secretary of the Screen Writers' Guild and remained there during much of the period about which this committee has heard. He left in 1946 when an issue arose as to the strike. His successor in the Screen Cartoonists' Guild was an individual by the name of Maurice Howard.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell it.

Mr. BREWER. M-a-u-r-i-c-e H-o-w-a-r-d. Both the Screen Cartoonists' Guild and the Screen Writers' Guild were close adherents to the Communist Party line, as it developed in subsequent periods.

A third individual appeared on the scene who came from the War Labor Board. His name is Milton Gotlieb. He came out of nowhere and became secretary of the Screen Publicists' Guild.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell that name, please.

Mr. BREWER. G-o-t-l-i-e-b, I believe, Milton Gotlieb. So we had three men within a relatively short period of time who moved from the Government into these fields, and each became part and parcel of this pro-Communist element that was attempting to create discord among A. F. of L. unions.

Mr. VELDE. You said Mr. Gotlieb came out of nowhere.

Mr. BREWER. So far as the studios were concerned, he was not a man who had any background for the job which he was picked for. He had been a representative of the War Labor Board in San Francisco and appeared suddenly as an important officer. In ordinary union procedure, a man is elected to that type of an office after he works his way up in the union. Mr. Gotlieb was brought in from the outside, so to speak, and his background was with the War Labor Board.

Mr. KEARNEY. These men all had formerly held Government employment?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

At the same time, the Conference of Studio Unions began to move to bring all of these groups under the painters' union. Of course, to a labor man it was a rather ridiculous thing that a group of screen publicists should be brought in as a part of the painters' union. But Mr. Sorrell was a painter, and they got a charter and became painters. They then proceeded to organize the secretaries, and I am sure that you will find that the testimony given by Mr. Hayden with reference to Bea Winters would show that connection. The secretaries also became members of the painters' union.

Mr. KEARNEY. They were painters, too?

Mr. BREWER. They were painters.



There were about 3,000 to 4,000 members of what we call the office workers' union, and they were organized in the Screen Office Employees' Guild, an affiliate of the painters. Since then they have changed and are in the A. F. of L. Office Employees' International Union of North America—I think that is the official title today—but at that time they were organized in the Screen Office Employees' Guild, and one of the organizers was Bernard Lusher.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell it.

Mr. BREWER. L-u-s-h-e-r, Bernard Lusher.

Mr. Hayden testified that the secretary of the cell which he was in—he identified two people, one by the name of Hjalmar and one by the name of Bernie, who represented the office workers. Bernard Lusher was a very active individual in all the programs that had to do with the Communist Party line, and as soon as the Screen Office Employees' Guild became a part of the International Office Employees' Union, Mr. Lusher disappeared and is now an organizer for the United Office and Professional Workers' Union recently expelled by the CIO for Communist domination. He recently figured in a case in California where a Jewish organization refused to bargain with his group because of Communist domination, and the court ruled they did not have to deal with them.

They began to have a very powerful organization, and all the time they were using it as a sounding board to damn IATSE. IATSE had gone through a very serious period because of the Browne-Bioff scandal, and it is generally recognized by those who know that a very fine job was done in cleaning it up, but, of course, these groups did not let the matter rest. Every place we turned it was thrown into our face that this was still a part of that racketeer union, and they built up a great deal of prejudice, not only within the Hollywood community, but within our own unions themselves, and there began to appear dissident factions. In local 44 it was led by Irving Henschel.

In August 1944, without any apparent reason, local 683 resigned from the Conference of Studio Unions. It was a little strange to us why that happened. There didn't seem to be any logical reason for it.

But in October of 1944 the first jurisdictional strike was called against the studios.

Mr. WALTER. Who were the officers of that local at the time it withdrew?

Mr. BREWSTER. The same officers, Norvel Cruther, Russell McKnight, and John Martin.

Up to that time the Conference of Studio Unions had taken the position they would not interfere with local unions, but after local 683 withdrew, they called a jurisdictional strike to force the studios to recognize the painters' union as bargaining agent for set decorators. Set decorators have charge of the property. If they were going to photograph this room, it would be the responsibility of the set decorators to see that all objects in the room were set properly. They had been members of our union for many years, but Mr. Sorrell was demanding to represent them.

The National Labor Relations Board asked them to go back to work and they immediately went back to work, and the matter began to boil from then on, and on March 12, 1945, the day I arrived in Hollywood,

the second strike began, and that was the one that was of prolonged duration, and the one which finally resulted in the A. F. of L. directive which had so much publicity.

If I might go back and point out in connection with CSU there was one very significant fact that took place about this time.

I believe it was early 1944—the date can be fixed by the minutes which I will supply you—a resolution was passed by CSU in connection with the filming of the life of Eddie Rickenbacker.

At that time Eddie Rickenbacker had made rather derogatory remarks about labor, and there was a great deal of criticism of him by labor. This resolution was passed by the CSU which said they would not work on the production of Captain Eddie.

Just about then Rickenbacker went to Russia, and when he came back he made glowing statements about the Russian Army, and as a result the resolution was not effective. But that resolution had significance to me because I could see what it would have meant.

This brings us up to the strike of 1945.

The other wing of this program, laid out in Carmel, was being carried out by John Howard Lawson and his associates.

Mr. POTTER. What do you mean by "other wing"?

Mr. BREWER. It was my analysis of the program that this Communist infiltration program was divided into two parts. One was the field which Mr. Kibre developed and which was taken over by Mr. Sorrell; and the other was developed by Mr. Lawson and his associates.

During this period, Mr. Lawson's unit had developed beyond their fondest expectations. In 1945 the atmosphere was almost perfect from their standpoint. At that time the Communist group in the Screen Actors' Guild and the fronts which they controlled completely dominated the intellectual thought of the community. Anybody who dared to express himself openly as opposed to communism found himself ostracized socially and otherwise.

Mr. VELDE. Will you give some examples of that ostracism?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. When I got to Hollywood I became a member of the Motion Picture Alliance. The Motion Picture Alliance was the only group of creative artists in Hollywood which had tried to oppose this Communist infiltration. That group was headed by an individual called James K. McGuinness. Mr. McGuinness, when he took over that job, was a very important individual in the motion-picture industry. He was the head of the production department at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. Mr. McGuinness, when I went there, had been branded as an anti-Semite. He had been branded as a reactionary. He had been branded as a Roosevelt-hater. And he was generally considered to be an individual that no one with any sort of liberal tendency should associate with. As a labor representative I was asked many, many times how I could sit in the same room with groups like this. It was the Motion Picture Alliance which eventually assisted in the hearings of 1947.

Mr. VELDE. You mean the hearings before this committee?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. And I can tell you one individual who at that point had had about 30 credits as a screen writer, and who has practically worked none at all since that time—Mr. Fred Niblo, Jr. Fred Niblo, Jr. comes from one of the old families. His father, Fred Niblo, Sr., was one of the producers of all time in the motion picture

industry, and Fred Niblo, Jr. has had practically no work since that time.

Mr. VELDE. Can you trace that to the fact he was a member of the Motion Picture Alliance in any detailed way?

Mr. BREWER. Well, at this time, as I say, the atmosphere against anyone who fought communism was very bitter. I was denounced. I was accused of being anti-Semitic too. My work is not in the field of the creative artists, but I have seen Mr. Niblo's credits, and he had a substantial record, and it fell completely and he is now working at Lockheed.

Another individual who testified before the committee in 1947 is Jack Moffitt, who also has had no work.

Mr. KEARNEY. Following out the line of questions by Mr. Velde, in view of the attitude we have been led to believe of the motion picture industry today, why is it that Fred Niblo can't get back to work in the motion picture industry?

Mr. BREWER. I can't answer authoritatively for that. It is hard for me to describe the situation that existed in Hollywood at that time. I lived through it.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am referring to today. Why can't he get back today? Hasn't the attitude among the motion-picture producers changed since those days?

Mr. BREWER. I think it has. Of course there is this fact that has to be taken into consideration, that there is a reduced amount of employment today as against what it was. The industry is being very selective. There are serious economic problems. My attitude is that now that this thing has been pointed up he will get work. But I think the influence of this group that existed in 1945, and their character assassination program—which I assure you was so effective that it is beyond my power to describe it—I think they were able to so discredit Mr. Niblo that they decided there was somebody better than he was.

Mr. KEARNEY. I apologize to counsel for interrupting, but I would like to ask this question: Do you have any knowledge as to whether any of the 10 Hollywood convicted writers are now selling their wares to the motion picture industry through a second or third party?

Mr. BREWER. Well, I have some information which would indicate that that was the case, but I can't prove that that is the case.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, you have a great suspicion that that is the case?

Mr. BREWER. Yes, I have information that that is the case.

Mr. KEARNEY. But you have no proof?

Mr. BREWER. That is right.

Mr. POTTER. Are there any records that would bear out your testimony about this character assassination?

Mr. BREWER. I do not think the opinion of one man is of much value, but I think if you could document the employment records of those individuals that were not acceptable to the Communist group as against those individuals who were in the forefront of it, I think you would find a rather substantial indication that there were influences at work.

Those influences work in many, many ways. Lots of times the opinion of a secretary or of a clerk in a casting bureau can make the difference between whether one man is hired or another man is hired.



I can see, from my standpoint, knowing the set-up in Hollywood, how easy it would be for an underground movement to use influence in such a way that an individual without such protection would be at a disadvantage, and I am of the definite opinion that was the case. I think it can be proven by records. I haven't attempted to do that, but in my judgment it could be done.

Mr. KEARNEY. If that condition I spoke of does exist, it shows that the motion-picture industry is not checking too carefully?

Mr. BREWER. I want to say that is not true today. The fellow who has any taint of communism on him today is having a tough time.

Mr. KEARNEY. Unless he sells his stories or writings through a second or third party?

Mr. BREWER. That is true.

Mr. KEARNEY. Then it is up to the industry to check?

Mr. BREWER. I don't think that is prevalent, but I think there have been some instances of it. One was testified to before this committee, the picture Chain Lightning.

Mr. DOYLE. I noticed you made the statement, I wrote it down: "At this point they and their front organizations were in complete control." At what point was that?

Mr. BREWER. That started about 1944 and continued until after the 1947 hearings.

Mr. DOYLE. Where you said "they and their front organizations," I don't want to take the time now, perhaps counsel will develop it, but in what way were the front organizations related?

Mr. TAVENNER. We will go into that subject pretty fully later.

Mr. DOYLE. Then I won't go into it now. I realize it is very important, because the witness has referred several times to their front organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. That will be the subject of an entirely different phase of his testimony.

Mr. DOYLE. That was in 1944?

Mr. BREWER. 1944 to 1947.

Mr. WOOD. In this connection, Mr. Counsel, I would like to make the statement that I have gone to some considerable pains personally to advise myself as to the attitude of responsible producers in the motion-picture industry, and I know at this time they are spending literally thousands and thousands of dollars undertaking to screen the backgrounds of all persons now employed in essential positions in the industry, and are exercising a great deal of diligence in that respect. I think it is only fair that that be placed in the record at this time.

Mr. KEARNEY. I take it, the chairman includes screen writers also?

Mr. WOOD. They are employees. That goes to all employees in the industry.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I didn't intend to convey the impression by my questions that the motion-picture industry was not cooperating fully in the hearings being conducted at the present time or in the ousting of Communist Party members from the motion-picture industry. I didn't mean to intimate that.

Mr. BREWER. I would like to say also that, as I testified earlier, the community did not believe this charge of Communist infiltration until after the 1947 hearings, and it was after the 1947 hearings they really



began to try to find out, and for the most part where they have known it and it was a certainty to them, they have cleaned them out.

The difficulty has been—and I think this is not only a problem for Hollywood, I think it is a problem for America—the difficulty has been to understand the nature of this problem. Many of the officials did not understand it. They did not realize what it consisted of, and would not have tolerated it had they known it.

The fact that the Communists were able to so cleverly disguise their real aims points up the danger of the Communist movement not only in Hollywood but throughout the country.

Mr. KEARNEY. You think the country is waking up?

Mr. BREWER. I think they are, but I think they have a great deal to learn, and I think the disclosures before this committee will help point up the real danger of it, because we can swing so far we will lay the groundwork for another invasion.

Mr. KEARNEY. I hope the country is waking up.

Mr. POTTER. Concerning this character assassination, I know it has been suggested by some of the professional people in Hollywood that they now are paying the penalty for anti-Communist attitudes they had in this critical period.

Mr. BREWER. I think the character assassination program they had, and the domination which they had over the life of the community, that is, the social and intellectual thought in the community, was very effective. Sometimes it would be a minor clerk in a casting office, or a secretary, who would indicate that so-and-so probably wouldn't be any good for that part: or maybe it would be one of the stories they would circulate that had no foundation, that so-and-so was a lousy writer. They had the machinery by which they could create the impression that so-and-so was not a good writer or that he had done something wrong and therefore would not be good for a part. They had that organization, and it was effective beyond the widest scope of your imagination.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of the possibility of people in a clerical position or otherwise influencing the employment of persons if they were members of the Communist Party, and as I understood it, you said it was your opinion that practice had been resorted to. Do you have any information or any knowledge of any instances in which a secretary or other employee who was a Communist influenced the employment of a Communist or the failure to employ a non-Communist?

Mr. BREWER. No, I don't. I was not really close enough to that to know. I had my hands full with my own problems. That was a secondary line, and I didn't develop that. I know the Screen Office Employees' Guild had a large segment that responded to the Communist cause, so it would seem to me only the natural thing if that happened.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for you to state the full name of the Motion Picture Alliance.

Mr. BREWER. Motion Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals.

Mr. POTTER. Who is the president of that?

Mr. BREWER. John Wayne is chairman and I am chairman of the executive board.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you had gotten into a discussion of the operation of the Conference of Studio Unions. The chairman has indicated that we will not be in session more than about 10 or 15 minutes more. Let me suggest that you stop at a logical break in your testimony. I am not certain whether now is the time.

Mr. BREWER. I think I could catch up with the fact that during the history which I have described in some sort of a chronological form in the unions, at the same time this other field was being developed by John Howard Lawson, and a great number of fronts appeared, and that element in the community became a very powerful influence, not only in the motion-picture industry but in the Los Angeles community and in the State of California also.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would prefer that we make the subject of the fronts and of the political influence of which you speak the subject of your testimony later, because I think it is too big to get into in 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. BREWER. Then I can describe my analysis of what I think the next step would have been had they been successful in getting control of the unions, because I think that was a very key factor.

From my analysis of what went on it is my firm conviction that had they been successful in eliminating the A. F. of L. unions, including IATSE, from the Hollywood scene, that they then would have merged all these unions into one big union and used that as an instrument to combat the Motion Picture Alliance.

From my analysis it seems to me clear that had they succeeded they would have been able to effectively dominate the content of pictures, because they had been successful in influencing the minds of quite a few of the artists. Mr. Dmytryk and Mr. Collins testified to that. But they were restrained because the producers were ready to stop them.

Mr. WALTER. Weren't they at the point that had the producers been willing, they could have proceeded to influence the content of the pictures?

Mr. BREWER. The unions would have given them the power so that a producer who had resisted could have been branded as antilabor, and it would have been a relatively easy step to have used the unions as a whip by which they almost could have forced the producers to put into the films the material that they wanted, and it is my considered opinion that that was the real intent. I don't think even the leaders in Hollywood realized it, that is, the secondary leaders, but I am confident that was their real aim.

When the Motion Picture Alliance was formed it was only a small group, and their power never did offset the power of the group I have mentioned, but they branded the MPA all over the world.

Mr. McGuinness has mentioned that we got communications from all over the world branding MPA as a vicious Fascist organization and using all the vituperation of which the Communists are capable to destroy it.

Just before Mr. McGuinness died I was talking to him and he said, "When our organization was formed such a cry went up that I went to some of my friends and I said to them, 'What have we stepped on? We are not worthy of all this opposition.'" Mr. McGuinness said, "Until you made this statement tonight I never fully understood why they were so afraid of MPA."

If you go back to Mr. Kibre's reports you will find, running through those reports, a statement which indicated the difficulty with which they were being able to bring the guilds into an organization with the unions, and how difficult it was to bring them around.

It is my judgment that in 1945 they had reached the conclusion that the time was ripe to do that, and that the purpose of the 1945 strike, which developed a little earlier than they had anticipated, the real purpose was to knock out the A. F. of L. control, and that at the same time the IATSE was right to bring about this merger and overall control. Then they would have had this one organization and Mr. Lawson and his associates could have been dictating to the motion picture industry. It would have been very effective, I am sure.

Mr. WOOD. I think this is a good place to stop.

Mr. JACKSON. Before we stop, usually the connotation that attaches to names mentioned here is unfavorable. Of your own knowledge, who are a few of the people who have been instrumental in battling this Communist situation?

Mr. BREWER. Well, the leader, I think, of the group in the creative field undisputedly was Mr. McGuinness. And John Wayne, the new chairman, is carrying on. Clark Gable has been a member of our organization since its inception. Clarence Brown, a producer at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. Mr. John Klorer, the writer. Morrie Ryskind. There are many others. Then in the trade-union field, our union; and Ralph Clare of the teamsters union, and before him Joe Toughey; and Mr. Lew Helm and Ben Martinez of the plasterers union have been militantly loyal. There are others who have fought, and there are other star names.

Mr. WALTER. Sidney Blackmer.

Mr. BREWER. Robert Taylor and Charles Coburn.

Mr. KEARNEY. Adolph Menjou.

Mr. BREWER. Ward Bond. Cliff Lyons, the stunt man. There are a number.

Mr. JACKSON. Would it be proper if the witness could prepare and leave with the committee a list of those people who have been leading the fight against communism in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. WOOD. The committee would be very glad to have such a list.

The committee will stand adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10:30.

(Thereupon, at 4 p. m. on Thursday, May 17, 1951, an adjournment was taken until Friday, May 18, 1951, at 10:30 a. m.)





# COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD MOTION- PICTURE INDUSTRY—PART 2

FRIDAY, MAY 18, 1951

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Washington, D. C.*

## PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:30 a. m. in room 226, Old House Office Building, Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives John S. Wood, Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder (appearing as noted in transcript), Harold H. Velde, Bernard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Thomas W. Beale, Sr., assistant counsel; Louis J. Russell, senior investigator; William A. Wheeler, investigator; and John W. Carrington, clerk.

Mr. Wood. The committee will be in order. Let the record show that the following members of the committee are present: Mr. Walter, Mr. Velde, Mr. Kearney, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Potter, and Mr. Wood, a quorum of the committee.

Do you wish to proceed further with the witness you had yesterday?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I would like to recall Mr. Brewer.

## TESTIMONY OF ROY M. BREWER—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Brewer, when the session was adjourned yesterday you were speaking of the Conference of Studio Unions, and you testified regarding the efforts to organize that group. Can you state to the committee who were the principal leaders in that movement?

Mr. BREWER. In the Conference of Studio Unions?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. BREWER. Yes; I can.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think in answering that question that you should make it clear whether or not the persons that you name are members of the Communist Party, if you know. I do not think you should leave it in the position of naming persons connected with that organization who were not members of the Communist Party if you know they were not.

Mr. BREWER. Well, of course, in that case I will try to point out to you the people who participated who had Communist records, but not being on the inner circles of the Communist movement, I am not in a position to testify "yes" or "no" to many of these people. I will

try to point out to the committee those persons whose records have been firmly established, and then I would like to also point out to the committee the names of those persons who carried the program within the conference which coincided with the Communist program, so that they can be checked, because I think that is important also.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Brewer, I request that you try to talk sufficiently loud so that we can hear you up here. And I have an announcement to make. I am told we are honored this morning to have in the committee room some 10 or more members of the German Parliament. I am glad to extend to them a welcome here.

Proceed.

Mr. BREWER. First of all, I think it is very important to recognize that in this conflict in Hollywood, as is almost always the case in a conflict in which the Communists are involved, you never get a chance to fight it out on a pure Communist and anti-Communist issue. If you did, it would be relatively simple. The real danger of Communists is that they come in and exploit a disagreement, as they are doing throughout the Nation and throughout the world, and create a situation which causes a violent conflict; and while they may not be the ones who fight all of the war, they are certainly the ones who direct it and who benefit from the victory.

In this case we had two separate and distinct forces at work in the Conference of Studio Unions. The main group was the pro-Communist group, which was under the leadership of Herbert K. Sorrell.

The question of Mr. Sorrell's arrangements with the Communist Party has been one that has been under dispute for a long time, and it is a matter of which I made a very thorough study, because in my position I had to know whether Mr. Sorrell was loyal to the principles of the American Federation of Labor, which he purported to be, or whether he was an agent of the Communist Party.

So far as the conclusions are concerned, they are positive in the fact that he was, or at least had been, a member of the Communist Party, and that he was working in close collaboration with them, and that every time the issue came down, for the most part he took the Communist Party position.

That doesn't mean that there weren't some conflicts as this thing progressed, because there were. We made a very thorough study of them so that we knew exactly where they were. Mr. Sorrell, according to the evidence that has been presented—and there is a very complete documentation that was presented before the House Committee on Education and Labor in connection with the investigation of this strike. There was presented in evidence at that hearing a Communist Party receipt book which was identified as a Communist Party receipt book. There was also introduced in evidence at this hearing a control card which was identified as a Communist Party record.

Mr. VELDE. Communist Party record for whom?

Mr. BREWER. It was written in the name of Herbert Stewart. It was alleged that Herbert Stewart was the party name of Herbert K. Sorrell. Those records were submitted to the FBI, and the FBI made an analysis of the handwriting on the control card and on the Communist Party receipt book, and they issued a report to the committee which is on page 2281 of volume 3 of those proceedings, in which they positively identified the handwriting on the Communist Party receipt book and

on the Communist Party control card as the writing of Mr. Herbert K. Sorrell.

Prior to that, this same document had been examined by two of the foremost handwriting experts in America, Mr. Clark Sellers and Mr. John Harris. Mr. Clark Sellers is the man who rose to national prominence in his identification of the Hauptmann note in the Lindbergh kidnapping case. Both of those men positively identified Mr. Sorrell's handwriting on that card.

Mr. WALTER. What is Mr. Sorrell doing today?

Mr. BREWER. He is still officially president of the Conference of Studio Unions. Whether he draws a salary, I don't know. I might say further, Mr. Sorrell has been tried before his international union, the Painters' International Union, and has been found guilty by the painters' brotherhood of having been a participant in Communist activities, and has been banned from office for 5 years, and is at this moment testing the legal validity of that action in the courts. He is still around Los Angeles and still represents himself as the spokesman for the Conference of Studio Unions, but the Conference of Studio Unions represents no one any more that I know of except a small group of painters, none of whom, or very few of whom, work in the studios at all. With reference to the representation of the painters, a National Labor Relations Board election was held, and Mr. Sorrell's union was defeated by my organization as the bargaining representative of those painters.

Another way Mr. Sorrell was identified, Rena Vail in 1944 testified before the California Un-American Activities Committee that she attended a Communist convention at which Mr. Sorrell was sergeant at arms.

There is also testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor, which I mentioned previously, by a labor leader by the name of Robinson that in 1937 Mr. Sorrell attempted to recruit him into the Communist Party. So that there can be no question of doubt as to the connection between Mr. Sorrell and the Communist Party.

Mr. WOOD. Notwithstanding the fact that this evidence has been in existence for some years as to his Communist affiliation, do you know of any instance where he has ever denied it?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. He has denied that he was a member. He denied it before the House committee. But his denial was proven conclusively, in my judgment, false, before that committee. He has denied that he was a party member, but, as I say, that denial has been overruled overwhelmingly, in my judgment, by the preponderance of evidence.

I will say this, that in later years there is some evidence of his deviation from the party line, which would indicate to me, and Mr. Sorrell himself has made the statement, that he had a deal with the Communists; that he was to carry their program and they were to let his union alone.

So my personal analysis of Mr. Sorrell's connection with the party is this, for what it is worth, if the committee wants it: That Mr. Sorrell became a member of the Communist Party in 1936 or 1937; that he remained in the party as an active and disciplined party member until 1940. My reason for that is that in 1946, during the period of the pact, a group in California, headed by Ellis Patterson, organized what was known as the Patterson slate of candidates for delegates to the Demo-



cratic Convention, and this was an anti-Roosevelt slate of candidates. In the propaganda for this slate of candidates for delegates, they attacked Mr. Roosevelt as a warmonger, and Mr. Sorrell was one of the candidates that ran on that ticket. Of course that ticket was defeated, they were not elected, and Mr. Roosevelt was nominated, and in the general election Mr. Sorrell did support Mr. Roosevelt. Disciplined party liners in that election did not support Mr. Roosevelt. Therefore, it is my opinion, confirmed by what Mr. Sorrell himself said, that at that point he made a deal with them that he would be relieved of some of the party tasks, but in return he would carry on their program in the guilds.

I have a complete documentation, which I am sure you gentlemen have, of his participation in Communist fronts. He was completely supported by men who were Communists.

In connection with local 683—

Mr. POTTER. Is that the painters?

Mr. BREWER. No. That was the laboratory technicians' local, which we contend was captured by the Communists in 1940.

Mr. VELDE. What is the full name of that?

Mr. BREWER. Film Technicians' Local 683 of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees. It embraced the men and women who processed the film. The secretary of that local was Norvel Crutcher. Norvel Crutcher has been active in Communist Party circles, and we were informed through confidential sources that his party name was Norman Newman, and that he was a member of the cultural commission that directed the Communist activities in Hollywood, and there is absolutely no question in my mind, although the documentary evidence is not strong in that respect, but that Mr. Norvel Crutcher was an important individual in the Communist Party and was one of the key figures.

There was an individual by the name of Helmer Bergman.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the first name?

Mr. BREWER. I have seen it spelled two ways, H-e-l-m-e-r and H-j-a-l-m-e-r, and I am not sure which is the official spelling, but Helmer Bergman was a member of the Communist Party who had been employed by the Russian Government as a technical adviser to the motion-picture industry in Russia, and had spent 2 years in Russia in that capacity.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder entered hearing room.)

Mr. POTTER. What was his capacity with the union?

Mr. BREWER. He was a spokesman for the Electricians' Local, No. 40, in the studios, and was a member of the strike strategy committee of the Conference of Studio Unions, and was generally active in the picket lines.

There was an individual by the name of George Bradley. George Bradley, at the time of the first strike, was vice president of the building Service Union, which embraced the janitors and the cleaning people in the studios. George Bradley was a member of the strike strategy committee of the Conference of Studio Unions, and he had previously lived in Seattle, and while in Seattle he had run for the Senate of the United States as a candidate of the Communist Party. We presented in evidence before the Central Labor Council a photostatic copy of the ballot with his name appearing officially as a candidate for the Senate of the United States as a Communist.



In the Screen Writers' Guild there was William Pomerance. William Pomerance was formerly identified with the National Labor Relations Board, and at the time he was serving in that capacity he was involved in a situation which resulted in his transfer and in his ultimately leaving the Board, and it was generally known and generally the gossip of the community that this was a Communist faction that had been set up to try to influence the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. KEARNEY. A Communist faction set up within the Government?

Mr. BREWER. That is true. There were three members of the field examining staff of the Board at that time. The third was Maurice Howard.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know of any others?

Mr. BREWER. I don't. But I know that in this situation we had out there, there was a definite link between certain people in the National Labor Relations Board and the Communist Party.

Mr. KEARNEY. A link between the Government and the Communist Party?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; and I will give you some additional evidence in that connection as we go along.

Mr. MOULDER. Is that a local board in California?

Mr. BREWER. This was in the thirties when Mr. Howard and Mr. Pomerance were employed.

Mr. POTTER. Who was the third one?

Mr. KEARNEY. You mentioned his name yesterday, did you not?

Mr. BREWER. No; I did not, and I don't know anything about him except that people involved in that named these three as individuals who were involved in this matter. I have that name, and if you will bear with me I will look it up. It is a name that means nothing to me otherwise. (After examining papers.) His name was Robert Muir, M-u-i-r, according to the information I have.

Mr. POTTER. Do you know where any of the three gentlemen are today?

Mr. BREWER. Mr. Pomerance is in New York City and I understand is now a producer of television films. Mr. Maurice Howard was defeated as the business agent for the Cartoonists' Guild about 2 years ago, and has since disappeared. I don't know where he is now.

Mr. POTTER. The one engaged in producing television films, do you know what type of films he is producing?

Mr. BREWER. I understand they are commercial films being produced by companies who put them on as advertising films. I am sure his address is available and it can be determined.

Mr. VELDE. You mentioned that this took place in the thirties. Can you fix that time a little more definitely?

Mr. BREWER. Well, Mr. Pomerance left the Board following the election of 1939. He was the field examiner for the National Labor Relations Board at the time the election of 1939 was held, so it was immediately following the election of 1939 that he left the Board.

Mr. MOULDER. What election in 1939?

Mr. BREWER. The National Labor Relations Board election which I referred to yesterday.

Following that election, he went from the National Labor Relations Board to the business agency of the Screen Cartoonists' Guild, and in due course of time went to the Screen Writers' Guild and served

as the business representative of the Screen Writers' Guild, and has been identified, I am sure, by Mr. Collins as one of those individuals who was active in the control of the guild.

Mr. VELDE. Are you personally acquainted with Lee Pressman?

Mr. BREWER. No, I am not.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know if he was counsel for the National Labor Relations Board about the same time these gentlemen were field representatives for the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. BREWER. I am quite sure that was the same time, and it was also the time Nathan Witt was executive secretary of the Board, and about the time when Edwin S. Smith was a member of the Board proper.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the committee, the staff has the address, knows the address, of Mr. William Pomerance, and has had in mind for sometime that he should be called as a witness.

Mr. BREWER. There were many other links. There was another link that was very important. There was an individual by the name of Emil Freed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell it, please?

Mr. BREWER. F-r-e-e-d. Emil Freed was not a member of the Conference of Studio Unions; he was a member of Machinists' Local 312; but he was definitely in these councils in connection with the Hollywood strike, and was arrested in the picket line and sentenced to jail.

Emil Freed was a known Communist. He had participated openly in Communist activities in and around Los Angeles County, and injected himself into this strike and was arrested as a result of his activities in the picket line, and was generally known to be influential.

There are many other instances of Communist association which I could point out, but it has been quite a long time ago and it is difficult offhand to remember all of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. The question that I was asking related to the Conference of Studio Unions, in which the persons you mentioned were leaders. What was the activity of that union under the leadership of those individuals which indicated the Communist Party purposes?

Mr. BREWER. Well, as I say, in the first place we had certain groups within our own unions. We had the situation where the Conference of Studio Unions would take a position attacking our international, and then springing up within our own unions would be groups that would support that position in concert with the enemy, instead of what would normally be their union allegiance.

One of these groups was the group led by Irving Henschel. Irving Henschel was always injecting the position of the Conference of Studio Unions, and was almost always supporting their position as against the position of the International Alliance.

Mr. TAVENNER. You identified Henschel yesterday in your testimony.

Mr. BREWER. Yes. He was a Communist Party member.

Mr. POTTER. Is Mr. Henschel still in your union?

Mr. BREWER. No. He was expelled. A lawsuit is still pending in connection with that, but we expect our position will be sustained.

Mr. POTTER. He was expelled because of his Communist activities?

Mr. BREWER. Yes, because of his activity in connection with this strike.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed.

Mr. BREWER. As I say, in addition to this group which carried what we considered to be the Communist Party program, there was also the program of some of the building trades unions, which at least thought they had a jurisdictional grievance with our international union, and that was led by the carpenters' union.

The carpenters' union is not Communist directed nor Communist controlled. They felt they had a grievance, and the Conference of Studio Unions told them, "If you will support our program we will settle all your grievances and we will see that you get the jurisdiction you think you should have from IATSE." They were very clever in exploiting any difference of opinion between our union and this group, and they did bring the carpenters's union in the conference.

This required the conference to make some compromise with their own position as they went along. From my analysis and the analysis of those who can look back, it seems clear that the immediate purpose of the 1945-46 strike was to break the position of IATSE, because we were the only union that had the economic strength as an international union to break them.

The carpenters' union is a union of tradesmen, and they are not an important force in the motion-picture industry. So if they had been able to use the disagreements between our union and the carpenters' union to break our strength in the studios, they would have had a relatively easy job to then move in and swing the whole thing to their one big union idea.

We have in our possession, and I will make available to this committee, a complete set of the minutes of the Conference of Studio Unions since its inception.

Mr. TAVENNER. We would like to have that.

Mr. BREWER. I will make that available to you. In those minutes you can see the pattern of Communist infiltration by the actions which they took and by the individuals who brought in the motions or resolutions.

Here was an A. F. of L. union that was presumably loyal to the American Federation of Labor, but they were constantly taking positions in support of Harry Bridges, and other positions in direct conflict with the American Federation of Labor positions. In repeated instances they showed their contempt for the leadership of the American Federation of Labor. That is all brought out in a clear form in these minutes, and shows how the Communist control developed.

So that while there were anti-Communist groups within the conference, the record shows that in any major test they were able pretty well to swing the influence to the Communist side.

As I say, they did make some compromises from time to time, and if you know the Communist cause, you know they are willing to do that, to make compromises where necessary, but the over-all pattern of the situation is clear—the fact that Mr. Pomerance was one of the founders of this Conference of Studio Unions, and that Mr. Crutche and his associates were active in the Conference of Studio Union and the fact that when the test came the Communist fraction, local 4, rose to their support and aid.



A citizens' committee was organized of people who had Communist backgrounds and who had no connection with the motion-picture industry. I have the record of the citizens' committee.

Mr. VELDE. When was that formed?

Mr. BREWER. In 1945. It was an adjunct to the apparatus running the strike.

Mr. WALTER. Have you a list of people who permitted themselves to be used by this Communist group?

Mr. BREWER. I have a list of the officers of the Conference of Studio Unions. I cannot document in each individual case the Communist Party record of those individuals who were carrying the Communist Party program, but I can tell you from our study of the situation—and, believe me, I want to be just as objective in this as I can—those people who carried the Communist program in this strike, and who were in it by reason of their associations and by reason of programs which they carried. I will be glad to give this to you if I can find the list.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the committee consider whether a list of that type, under those circumstances, which the staff has not had a chance to investigate or follow up, should be given to the committee in executive session, or handed to the committee, rather than to name the persons?

Mr. WALTER. If it is made amply clear that there is no positive proof that they are Communists, I see no reason why we should not know who lent themselves to this sort of a movement. I think it is perfectly apparent that all these people are not Communists.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Brewer has made that perfectly clear.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. That is based on his opinion.

Mr. BREWER. It is based upon more than my opinion. It is based upon my knowledge of the activities which went on and the persons who were active in directing those activities. As I say, there is no way that I know of at this point that you can say beyond any question of a doubt as to whether each of those individuals were or were not members of the Communist Party.

Mr. WALTER. Have those names been made public before?

Mr. BREWER. They were a matter of public record at the time.

Mr. WALTER. Have any of them denied Communist Party membership?

Mr. BREWER. Most of them do. Generally speaking, if you say someone is a Communist, even if you have the record, if they think they can get away with it, they deny it. Some have and some have not.

Mr. WOOD. What good purpose can it serve in this investigation to put in the public record the names of people as to whom we have no proof of Communist affiliation? If counsel and the staff feel the list would be of aid to them, let it be submitted to the counsel for such use as the staff may make of it.

Mr. JACKSON. How many names have you, Mr. Brewer?

Mr. BREWER. About 40, I would say.

(Representative Clyde Doyle entered hearing room.)

Mr. BREWER. Then I will confine myself to those individuals who have definite records of Communist association, at least.



Mr. TAVENNER. Will you submit that list to the staff of the committee for such investigative purposes as it desires to make of it?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; I will be very happy to.

One other very significant factor in connection with this whole matter is the matter of the attorneys who represented these people. In almost every instance when we got in litigation there was one of two law firms which appeared as the representatives of these individuals, and I might say that in connection with local 683 which I mentioned they had as their retainer the law firm of Katz, Gallagher & Margolis, which has since become the firm of Margolis & McTernan. This firm has a long record of activity in defending known Communists and in defending Communist causes. This committee, I think, needs not have any information on that.

The local union which went on strike against their international union was represented by Katz, Gallagher & Margolis.

Mr. WALTER. As a matter of fact, a witness a short while ago identified Margolis as a Communist Party member.

Mr. BREWER. That is right. The firm of Katz, Gallagher & Margolis appeared as an important factor. Katz, Gallagher & Margolis appeared as representatives of local unions of our international which were supporting the Conference of Studio Unions in defiance of our union, and Katz, Gallagher & Margolis also defended many of the other unions.

In connection with the trial of Irving Henschel, who eventually was tried for his activity in supporting the pro-Communist group, Katz, Gallagher & Margolis were brought in by the group defending Mr. Henschel to assist them in his defense, and they later filed a lawsuit in his behalf. That firm also appeared in many of the National Labor Relations Board cases. In the case of the set decorators' union, which set the whole strike off, Margolis was attorney for the Conference of Studio Unions in that particular case.

In addition to Mr. Margolis, when Mr. Henschel was tried by our union for his activities, the business agents of several of our other local unions came to his defense, and one of the business agents that came to his defense was the business agent of local 683, and, by a rather strange coincidence, just about the time that this trial was to proceed, local 683 paid a fee to Margolis of \$3,000 for some unexplained reason, which indicated to us that local 683 was actually hiring Mr. Margolis to defend Mr. Irving Henschel, a known Communist.

Another individual who defended Mr. Henschel was Ted Ellsworth, who went on the radio in a blast against our international union at the height of the strike and attacked our international, along with Phil Connelly, Herbert Sorrell, and others.

As a labor man, there was one instance that convinced me that the line of division in this strike was not the trade-union line at all, but the Communist line. It took place like this: Presumably we were in a jurisdictional dispute with the painters. That was, on the face of it, what the dispute was about. One of the trade-union principles is that if a man is a member of an international union he should support his union in a jurisdictional dispute.

I went down to the Central Labor Council and began to examine into the affiliations of the men in the council. I found that the president of the Central Labor Council was a painter, so I naturally assumed he would support Mr. Sorrell, who was also a painter. On the

executive board of the council was Mr. Norvel Crutcher, business agent of local 683. I naturally supposed he would support us. But I found on the first vote the painter was on our side and our business agent was on the other side, the side of the Conference of Studio Unions.

So all along the line it became clear that the line of demarcation was not the trade-union line, but the Communist Party line. That is the way we followed out the strike, and I assure you if we had not analyzed it accurately we would have lost the strike and they would have had control.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by "control," and to what extent did control affect the moving-picture industry?

Mr. BREWER. Well, of course, the motion-picture industry, by its nature, is vulnerable to a militant trade-union structure. It requires a very great investment, and when schedules are set and commitments are made, a strike called at a crucial moment can cause very great financial loss.

It was very obvious from the "quickie" strikes called by Mr. Sorrell that he appreciated that. In line with the general program that was shaped up, if the Communist groups got control of the unions, together with the influences in the creative field, they could easily have branded a producer as being antilabor and just said, "We won't work for him." That was the plan in connection with the Rickenbacker picture, which I mentioned yesterday, which plan was abandoned apparently because of the statements he made about Russia.

Another important factor in this question of Communist domination came to a showdown on the issue of arbitration. These groups were accusing us of refusing to arbitrate, and when the arbitration was settled they would find some technical reasons for refusing to take the arbitration.

In the latter phase of the 1946 strike the Screen Actors' Guild got into this matter very earnestly, and they tried to work out a program of arbitration which would prevent these jurisdictional disputes, which, on the surface, seemed to be the base of the trouble.

They held several meetings at the Knickerbocker Hotel, and a complete transcript of the proceedings was taken. They held some follow-up meetings, and it looked like we were going to work out a program of arbitration. Under the leadership of Larry Bielensohn we held a series of meetings, and we agreed essentially on the basic points for an arbitration program. Larry Bielensohn, along with the attorneys for the CSU, were to work out the details of arbitration.

The attorneys for CSU were three law firms: Katz, Gallagher & Margolis; the firm of Pestana & Esterman, and in that connection I will present some information; and a third representative was Abe Isserman, who was brought from New York to sit in on these conferences and help direct the proceedings. Mr. Isserman is one of the attorneys in New York who defended the 11 Communists and who is now serving a term for his contempt, or who is under indictment for that.

So here we had these three firms. We had agreed upon the essential elements for this arbitration and the lawyers, including Mr. Bielensohn, were to draft the agreement into a legal form.

The next day each of us got a draft proposed by Mr. Esterman which completely changed all the basic principles we had agreed upon,

and it was at that point that the Screen Actors' Guild made the charge that there were elements who did not want the strike settled, and they could no longer remain neutral in the matter.

MR. POTTER. Who was head of the Screen Actors' Guild at that time?

MR. BREWER. Mr. Ronald Reagan.

MR. DOYLE. Was Mr. Esterman in on the previous conferences?

MR. BREWER. Yes. So the arbitration was knocked out the window and the strike was never settled.

When you put this whole picture together, there was no one close to the strike who today does not share the view that the real force behind that strike was the Communist group.

MR. POTTER. The list you have that you mentioned a while ago were people interested in continuing the strike, that is, working for the interest of the CSU?

MR. BREWER. The list I have were officers of the CSU, but I would like to reserve the right to indicate those who we felt confident were not under the influence of the Communist Party. There were others we felt pretty sure were under the influence of the Communist Party.

There were others we felt pretty sure were under the influence of the Communist Party.

MR. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, don't you think that would be helpful? After all, I think it would be very helpful.

MR. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman to mean he wants those names given in open session?

MR. POTTER. They are the ones we have been talking about all morning.

MR. WOOD. I think it is pertinent to the inquiry for the witness to mention the names of those he has cause to believe were in the Communist movement.

MR. BREWER. I will be glad to do that. I would like to make one point, that Mr. William Esterman was also a recent associate with the National Labor Relations Board, and he had appeared as an agent of the Board in earlier cases in this very matter.

MR. KEARNEY. That is the fourth person you have named from the Government?

MR. BREWER. Yes. I will give you a couple more.

MR. KEARNEY. We would like to have all you have.

MR. BREWER. I can give you one other instance that ties this in with the National Labor Relations Board. In connection with the investigation of Mr. Henschel and the Communist fraction which worked at Warner Studios, a proceeding was brought before the National Labor Relations Board, and they sent a field examiner out by the name of Kamaroff.

MR. WOOD. Spell it.

MR. BREWER. K-a-m-a-r-o-f-f, Michael Kamaroff. We felt that Mr. Kamaroff was very hostile to us, and he did not seem to be administering the matter in a fair manner. All we could do was complain, but in the course of this very investigation, when he was supposed to be making an investigation of Mr. Irving Henschel, he was lost up in the mountains, and he got some publicity, and it was brought out that he had been skiing with Herbert and Edward Biberman. In his recommendation this case was recommended for complaint, and



a formal charge was issued by the National Labor Relations Board in this case.

In the course of the case a field examiner was sent out from Washington, D. C., to hear the case, and he heard the case and issued an intermediate report, and we were so shocked at the terms of that intermediate report, which seemed to lean so far to this group which was purely a Communist fraction, that he began to inquire into the background of this examiner, Mr. Reimer.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell that?

Mr. BREWER. R-e-i-m-e-r. We found he was the first secretary of the National Lawyers' Guild, and that his wife was active in work here in Washington lobbying for a front listed as subversive, and in addition he was active in the defense of George Wheeler, who was left on the staff of General Clay, but later renounced his citizenship of the United States and became a citizen of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. KEARNEY. He is the man who went behind the iron curtain?

Mr. BREWER. Yes, George Wheeler.

They sent another lawyer to try the case by the name of Robert Risman. Immediately after he presented the case on behalf of the Board he left the Board and set up a labor consultant service with Mr. Kamaroff, and was associated with him for a while.

Those are some of the problems we had in our effort to defend our position.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether the man you referred to as Reimer had the first name Mortimer?

Mr. BREWER. That is right. He was the trial examiner, and he found that not only were these men justified legally in joining forces with the Conference of Studio Unions, but they should be put back to work with back pay.

Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, he made a report in favor of the Communist Party?

Mr. BREWER. My analysis was that he stretched the law in such a way as to put these men we had identified as Communists back in important positions in the studios. Legally, what he said was that the right of this group to rebel and join with this wildcat strike was a protected right under the National Labor Relations Act, and therefore they should be reinstated with full back pay.

Mr. WALTER. Do you recall the approximate date of that decision?

Mr. BREWER. I think it was in the fall of 1947.

Mr. KEARNEY. Was that decision carried out?

Mr. BREWER. The decision was not carried out. The Board confirmed the decision in part. They said the employer had no right to discharge them until they were expelled from the union. Mr. Reimer said the employer had no right to discharge them even after they had been expelled, but the Board said that after they had been expelled by the union they could be discharged.

The company refused to comply with the order, and the case stayed in the Board until just before Mr. Denham left, and at that time he said to send all cases to the court for decision, and this case is now before the circuit court of appeals.

Mr. KEARNEY. Do you know if any of the four former Government employees you mentioned were card-carrying Communists?

Mr. BREWER. Mr. Henschel was identified as of 1938 as a Communist Party member for 3 years.



MR. KEARNEY. Was that while he was employed by the Government? I am asking about these former Government employees you mentioned.

MR. BREWER. I am sorry. As has been pointed out, Mr. Pomerance, who left the Board earlier, has been identified in these proceedings as a member of the Communist Party.

MR. KEARNEY. While he was employed by the Government?

MR. BREWER. The identification here I think was after he left the Government.

MR. VELDE. You mentioned this strike several times, and I am not quite clear on the dates of the strike. How many employees and what type of employees were involved?

MR. BREWER. May I make one point in connection with this other matter before I go to that?

MR. VELDE. Yes.

MR. POTTER. Do you know where Mr. Reimer is now?

MR. BREWER. I understand he is practicing law in Cleveland.

In connection with Mr. Frank Pestana, only recently, in testimony before the California Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Paul Crouch, who was I think for 17 years an official of the Communist Party, testified that he had been the district organizer for the Communist Party for Alameda County, and that while he was such an organizer, Mr. Frank Pestana was a member of the professional branch of the special section of that county. This is in the sworn testimony before that committee. He identified this special section as a section that had been organized for purposes of espionage.

In connection with the various strikes——

MR. TAVENNER. May I suggest that in answer to the Congressmen's question you develop the whole question of the number of strikes and what occurred.

MR. BREWER. The first of the series of strikes took place in October 1944. I was not there at that time, so my testimony is based upon the information I have gotten. It was a short-lived strike. It primarily consisted of painters. The group which later comprised the Conference of Studio Unions did not participate in that strike. I heard Sorrell say they just decided to go fishing, and the National Labor Relations Board ordered them back. So they came back to work and took their case to the Board, and the basis of the strike was an effort to get recognition for this group of set decorators.

The second strike took place March 12, 1945, and in that connection there is a very peculiar circumstance with respect to the Communist position. At the time that strike was called the official position of the party was no strikes. It was during the love feast days.

MR. VELDE. And the party was known as the Communist Political Association at that time?

MR. BREWER. That is right. There seemed to be a great deal of confusion the day the strike took place, because the People's World had been supporting Sorrell and supporting the Conference of Studio Unions, and on the morning of the strike, March 12, there seemed to be a great deal of confusion, which would indicate that they had not contemplated that it would come to a head that quickly.

In examining the official position of the party, we find that for 3 days the People's World never published one word about the strike,

so apparently there was confusion even on the part of the writers of the *People's World* and the party itself as to what the Communist Party line would be on the strike.

The day the strike started not one word came down from the *People's World*. That went on until Thursday of that week. On Thursday of that week, in a front page editorial, came down the party line, which was to end the strike. The formula which they were to accept was laid down clearly. They were to get the producers and IATSE to agree to have the matter submitted to the National Labor Relations Board. We had always agreed to that position, but they attempted to make it appear we did not.

That was on Thursday. Up to that day our laboratory union had observed their picket line. On that day they went back to work. Mr. Henschel and his associates had observed the strike. On that day they agreed to go through the picket line but not do any work.

The Screen Actors' Guild went back to work. The screen cartoonists went back to work. The screen publicists went back to work. Mr. Sorrell's union stayed out, and the carpenters union stayed out. Mr. Sorrell said there were some details he wanted to iron out with Hutcheson.

Mr. POTTER. Who is Hutcheson?

Mr. BREWER. President of the Carpenters' International Union, a well-known figure and a well-known anti-Communist. Sorrell arranged meetings with our union and Mr. Hutcheson. Mr. Hutcheson was adamant, would not budge, so Mr. Sorrell was in a quandary. It meant the difference between success and failure.

In this connection, it was very interesting to note the attitude on the part of Mr. Sorrell. I made a very thorough study of that. We found that the party was not too critical of Mr. Sorrell, but within the groups in Hollywood there began to be rumblings that Sorrell ought not be permitted to get away with this.

At one point, in May 1945, it appeared that the Communists were getting set to really discipline Mr. Sorrell for maintaining his position with Hutcheson rather than with the party, and an editorial appeared in the paper, *Good Guy Mr. Sorrell*, to the effect that Sorrell had been a good fellow and all that, but he should get these people back to work, that the war effort needed them.

Mr. JACKSON. What paper was that?

Mr. BREWER. The *People's World*.

Just about a month after that the Duclos letter hit the country and a peculiar phenomenon took place, and many of these people who had found reasons why they should not cross the picket line took a new position.

In due course a new strike vote was taken in the Screen Publicists' Guild, and it was defeated by the publicists. A new strike vote was taken in the Screen Office Workers' Guild and it was defeated. A new strike vote was taken in the Screen Cartoonists' Guild, and it carried so far as the cartoonists went, but as to the other two it did not.

Before very long, down came a directive from Mr. Lindeloff.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who is he?

Mr. BREWER. President of the Painters' International Brotherhood. A directive came from Lindeloff ordering these people to go out on strike and observe the picket lines. That split the union wide open. The majority stayed in and did not observe the picket line. That

was the basis on which the new union was established for office employees, because the people who went back formed an independent union and began building a new union.

It was at this point that new agitation began in the guilds for support of the strike, but, as Mr. Collins testified, they had oversold them in the first instance, and they couldn't get the writers to go, and couldn't get the actors to go, because many of them were under contracts and most of them were drawing good salaries.

So the strike continued on and it eventually began to wane.

That brought us up to October 5.

Mr. POTTER. Did any of the guilds support the strike?

Mr. BREWER. The talent guilds did not; no. The evidence is that they agitated a little bit, but a careful analysis indicated to me they began to see the dangers of it and didn't want to risk what they had.

Mr. VELDE. You mentioned the Duclos letter. What union was out on strike when the Duclos letter came out?

Mr. BREWER. The Studio Carpenters' Union; the building service employees, I am not sure.

Mr. VELDE. At the time the Duclos letter came out, only those unions were out on strike who were opposed to the Communist Party line; is that correct?

Mr. BREWER. Well, I don't think you can say that completely.

Mr. VELDE. Generally?

Mr. BREWER. Generally speaking, they were the ones whose leaders were not completely subject to party discipline, which at that time apparently included Mr. Sorrell.

Mr. VELDE. Then after the Duclos letter came out, do I understand you to say the Communist element in the labor unions caused other strikes?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. Then all the unions that had embraced the Conference of Studio Unions went on strike after the Duclos letter.

Mr. VELDE. About how long after the Duclos letter did they go out on strike?

Mr. BREWER. The issue was raised about the 1st of July. It was in July that these other unions went out.

Mr. VELDE. And isn't it a fact that at the time the Duclos letter came out there was dissension in the party itself?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; a great deal of confusion, but when the line came down in the People's World, you could see it quickly reflected in the activities of the unions which were under party discipline.

On October 5 a completely new change took place. A mass meeting was held the day previous to that at the Hollywood Legion Stadium, in which the leaders announced that they were going to get tough.

Mr. POTTER. Leaders of whom?

Mr. BREWER. Of the Conference of Studio Unions.

That was an understatement, because on October 5 there appeared around Warners Bros. studios mass picket lines of around 5,000 people, and planted in those picket lines were some pretty rough figures, and they virtually closed Warner Bros. studies at that time. Very few people got in. Mr. Warner couldn't get in himself, and those who tried were pretty roughly treated.



It was evident that the nucleus of this group was about 50 long-shoremen who had been sent by Bridges. I can't substantiate that by evidence, but I was told that Bridges was in Hollywood and attended the meeting at which the decision was made to get tough, and there was evidence of professional strikebreakers.

I will tell you one instance that convinced us we were not up against any group of people who didn't know the score. One of our men attempted to drive through the picket line in his car. He had his doors locked. And some picket walked up with a two-by-four and with one clip the door popped right open.

There were tons of debris, milk bottles, and rocks and stones, that were gathered up after that strike. It was a very bitter affair. An investigation was subsequently made of the violence in that connection by the State Committee of California on Law and Order, and I have here a report which I will leave. It is known as the C. Don Field report. He was chairman.

Mr. POTTER. How long did that strike continue?

Mr. BREWER. Well, the strike continued. On the following Monday after the violence broke out, which I think was the 8th or 9th, I am not sure, we attempted to organize our own forces to break through the lines, in cooperation with officials of Warners Bros. and Warner Bros. police. We got through that morning, but 150 men or more received medical treatment as a result of that effort to get in the studio.

Then there appeared a committee which was headed by John Garfield—appeared originally—and John Howard Lawson was on it, and they served notice on the public that they would be on the picket lines the next morning to see that the civil rights of the pickets were not violated.

Mr. KEARNEY. John Garfield, did you say?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. And they sent a telegram to Jack Warner, who couldn't get in, accusing him of being responsible for the violence. In a period of 8 days they completely neutralized the forces of law and order. They were in control of that community absolutely.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is that John Garfield the same one who testified before this committee that he hated communism?

Mr. BREWER. John Garfield was the first name on the list that I will supply you, and the first name on the announcement made to the press of their intention to be on the picket line to protect the civil rights of the strikers.

Mr. JACKSON. Did John Garfield take any other active part? Was he on the picket line?

Mr. BREWER. I can't say that he was. I was relatively new at that time. There was so much happening and we were under such pressure that I can't honestly say.

Mr. VELDE. I want to fix the date of this violence with reference to the Communist Party line in connection with the Duclos letter.

Mr. BREWER. This was October 5, 1945, about 4 months after the Duclos letter came out.

Mr. VELDE. It was after the Communist Party had followed the Duclos letter?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; and I think it was after the Communist Party was reorganized.

Mr. VELDE. That was the time John Garfield appeared on the scene?



Mr. BREWER. In the way in which I mentioned. He signed a telegram, along with this other group included among which was John Howard Lawson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that a group from the Screen Actors' Guild, or Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. BREWER. Not solely. It was a group of persons who were in a professional capacity rather than a so-called labor capacity.

Mr. KEARNEY. Did Garfield ever appear on the picket line?

Mr. BREWER. I can't swear that he did. I was under the impression that he did, but I can't say that he did.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said that for a period of some days the law-enforcement officials were neutralized by this group.

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What group were you referring to?

Mr. BREWER. The picket lines of the Conference of Studio Unions.

Mr. TAVENNER. There was some question in my mind whether you were referring to the action of a citizens' committee or to the action of a picket line.

Mr. BREWER. The forces of law and order seemed completely inadequate to cope with the situation.

Mr. KEARNEY. Was any attempt made to call out the National Guard or the State militia?

Mr. BREWER. There was some mention of it. Eventually the situation was improved somewhat. The citizens' committee, headed by Garfield, said they would be observers to see that the civil rights of the pickets were protected. To those of us who saw what happened it was funny. There were tons of debris and milk bottles and iron bars and chains after the strike. There was evidence in the ranks of these forces that they were completely delighted at the way they had been able to handle it. There was an investigation. I was in that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What group was that?

Mr. BREWER. The group of the Conference of Studio Unions. This was the first time when there seemed to be a real organized system of violence.

Eric Johnston then entered the picture. He had recently been retained as head of the Motion Picture Association. He came out and said, "This strike has got to end." We were willing to end it, but we did not want these forces who had been clearly identified to go back into the studios.

We took it up with Eric Johnston. We said we did not want these people who had caused the trouble to go back in the studios. We could not convince Eric Johnston that our position was correct. I remember one statement I made which I found later was true. I was trying to plead with him that the thing to do was bring in international unions. He said, "Sorrell will never agree with that, and we can't let this thing go on. We have to have peace in this industry."

I said, "Mr. Johnston, if you approach it in the way you are approaching it now you will get peace in the same way that Chamberlain got peace at Munich."

But he decided that that was his view—very honestly, I am absolutely convinced of that. So he flew to the American Federation of Labor and told the American Federation of Labor to formally intercede, and it was then that the American Federation of Labor handed down a directive that they would arbitrate the dispute.

Mr. KEARNEY. During these days of violence, can you definitely place Herbert K. Sorrell in that?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. He was indicted for conspiracy, although he was never convicted. He was the leader of it. There is no doubt about that, and I will say he was no mean protagonist. He was a very effective leader.

Mr. TAVENNER. Returning to your testimony regarding the list of observers, you testified in 1947 before this committee and gave the list of those individuals?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. That appears in your testimony?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And is this the list to which you referred: John Howard Lawson, John Garfield, John Wexley, Sidney Buchman, Howard Koch, Larry Adler, Lewis Milestone, Dalton Trumbo, Cary McWilliams, Frank Tuttle, Robert Rossen, and William Pomerance?

Mr. BREWER. I am quite sure that is the list. Before I testified positively I would have to refresh my recollection from the record.

Mr. TAVENNER. This is on page 354 of your testimony in 1947 [handing document to the witness].

Mr. BREWER. That was the list.

Mr. JACKSON. List of whom?

Mr. TAVENNER. List of persons who appeared as observers, to which he referred.

Mr. BREWER. That is the list; yes.

Then what happened was, the strikers went back to work, and, of course, one of the problems was: What will we do with the men we put in while the strikers were out?

Mr. POTTER. Did you say Eric Johnston appealed to your headquarters?

Mr. BREWER. To the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. POTTER. And was settlement reached at that time?

Mr. BREWER. Actually, it is supposed to be the first time in its history that the A. F. of L. interfered in that way, but they issued a directive in which they ordered the unions back to work and set up a three-man committee.

Then began a series of discussions within the American Federation of Labor, led by Mr. Hutcheson.

I am ahead of my story. The three-man committee came out and made a decision. There was one group of workers under the decision which the decision gave to IATSE, and as a result Mr. Hutcheson said he would not accept that decision.

Mr. JACKSON. What was the decision?

Mr. BREWER. They said the set erectors should go to IATSE, and everybody agreed except Mr. Hutcheson, but he did not call a strike. He said his union could work if they wanted to, but he would not, as president, agree to it.

That remained a source of agitation. Our union made a decision at that point. During the course of the strike it had been almost impossible for us to convince people of the Communist nature of this situation. Everyone thought we were only trying to justify our position, and we were not able to convince even Eric Johnston that the real trouble was this Communist influence.

Mr. VELDE. You were not able to convince your international president of that either, were you?

Mr. BREWER. At that point; yes. I will say this, that he didn't understand it as well as I did, but he certainly realized that there was something wrong. He was not sure that I was right in all my analyses, but in general he agreed that the Communist influence was there.

We went back to the American Federation of Labor in 1946 and tried to point it out to them, and he supported my position almost 100 percent, although he was not as close to it as I was, or as vocal as I was.

Mr. VELDE. You mentioned a while ago that this was the first time the A. F. of L. issued a directive of that kind.

Mr. BREWER. As far as A. F. of L. is concerned, that is correct. The A. F. of L. realized that Sorrell had been an unruly individual, but they were not convinced that Communist infiltration was as serious as we pointed out to them. They were not at all convinced of it. Up to this point every time we had mentioned it we had been confronted with the barrier, "After all, you have a strike and are trying to settle it."

After the strike was settled we launched on a program to show, in the absence of conflict, which presumably had been settled but which we knew would have to recur, the Communist influence.

We instituted charges against Sorrell. It almost ended up in a riot, but nevertheless it was a sounding board by which we were able to point out this activity.

Then we distributed Mr. Sorrell's record among these people showing how he had for a period of 10 years completely adhered to these activities. That was quite successful. We had a problem within our own membership to convince them.

Then a second strike took place in July.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said second. You have already described two.

Mr. BREWER. There was a third. It was short-lived.

Mr. TAVENNER. Actually, isn't it the fourth? You described a strike in 1944.

Mr. BREWER. That was the first.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then March 12, 1945.

Mr. BREWER. That was the second.

Mr. TAVENNER. And October 5 was a continuation of that same strike?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then this is the third strike?

Mr. BREWER. This is the third. This was over an issue of the machinists. We had a group of machinists who had joined our union during the course of the first episode, and the union had agreed to remove them from the studios. We thought that was wrong, but there didn't seem to be much we could do about it at the time. Then the machinists withdrew from the American Federation of Labor. When that happened we said, "We want these 40 men who have been barred to go back to work." Sorrell resisted that, but we finally were successful in getting that done. He was trying to generate a strike when the strike of July 4, 1946, took place, and at the last minute the unions lined up solidly against us, that is, all the substantial guilds.

When he saw this solid front of A. F. of L. unions, he said the reason he had called the strike was to get a contract. He was address-



ing a meeting of our members, trying to get them to support his position, and I found out about it and rushed to the meeting and confronted him on the platform, and I said, "If you really mean you are after a contract, we will join you, and if you join that, I invite you to go with me to the producers' association, and I will go with you, and we will see that you get a contract, but the jurisdictional issue must be kept out of it."

I issued that challenge, and it resulted in the so-called Treaty of Beverly Hills. We signed a contract, which was a basic contract, as a result of that meeting held in a cottage near the Beverly Hills Hotel.

Then there was a meeting at which Mr. Hutcheson got through a resolution which we found was a repudiation of the arbitration. His whole motive was to try to confuse the situation.

Sorrell didn't like the situation, but he was tied to Hutcheson, and the party line in any strike was pretty good at that time, because the party line changed completely. The result was that on September 16 the carpenters' union announced they would not work on any sets erected by the set erectors in our union.

This resulted in a sit-down strike. They were discharged, and they set up picket lines, and that started the fourth and last strike. Officially, it is still going on. That started September 16, 1946. The Communists supported the strike, generally speaking, and the Communist forces were completely smashed.

Some of the unions that had been in the conference came back in, in March or April of the following year, and are back in the studios and are working along very peacefully.

Mr. POTTER. Was there any violence in the last strike?

Mr. BREWER. The violence started almost where they had left off in October 1945, but we had learned a few things in that time, and we had organized our group, with the result that with the cooperation of the teamsters' union—I want to say that in this whole affair the teamsters' union was 100 percent in support of our position and the anti-Communist position, because they had had experience with these groups, and they never deviated at any point in that support.

Mr. WALTER. As a matter of fact, the smashing of the Communist influence came as a result of following the plan of Eric Johnston for the settlement of the entire trouble, didn't it?

Mr. BREWER. Well, except that the second strike, of course, the first plan did not settle the strike. In other words, the second strike did what we had tried to convince Mr. Johnston should have been done in the first strike, that the only way the internationalists should be permitted to come back was if they suppressed the Communist forces' influence in their unions. This second war was even more bloody than the first, because the first was a short war and the second was prolonged, and the picket lines took up where the others left off.

Mr. POTTER. What was Mr. Johnston's position in the second strike?

Mr. BREWER. Completely in sympathy with our view. He saw that there was no opportunity for peace with these forces at work.

The mass picket lines were violent. We had the workers meet at designated points and get in busses, and the busses were so heavy they could not be tipped over. Even police cars were tipped over. This is a matter of record, and pictures are available.

Mr. POTTER. In the second strike, did they have the sympathy of the guilds as they did before?



Mr. BREWER. It was not so pronounced. The whole situation had been materially clarified.

Mr. POTTER. Did John Howard Lawson take part?

Mr. BREWER. Oh, yes; of course.

Mr. POTTER. What about John Garfield?

Mr. BREWER. So far as I remember, John Garfield did not appear except in the meetings of the Screen Actors' Guild. He did not take a prominent part in the second strike situation.

Mr. VELDE. The second strike situation is the one in 1946?

Mr. BREWER. It is the fourth strike, but the second violent situation. They got these busses, and after things quieted down at Warner Bros. they moved to MGM. You never knew where they would be next. It was quite an extensive harassing operation. Gradually the effect of the strike began to wear off.

The very key spot in the motion-picture industry is the laboratory technicians. Before a set can be torn down they require that they be able to see the set on film.

In October 1946 local 683 joined the strike. The vulnerable spot was technicolor. The only place it could be processed was in the technicolor laboratory in Hollywood. That local was under the control of Crutcher, McKnight, and Martin. Under the guise of wanting a contract—which was merely a guise because we had agreed to a 40-percent raise—this union shut down the technicolor laboratories. They had 20 million unprinted negatives in their plant at that time. It was really a crisis.

Then we moved in, under our constitution, and took charge of the laboratory local, and attempted to get physical possession of it, but they refused to let us.

It was during the early days of the strike of the laboratory local that the most noted violence took place, in the form of five bombings. Five of the homes of our members who broke with the pro-Communist membership were bombed. One member, Pottle, suffered a broken arm. They concentrated on technicolor, and finally it progressed to the whole of the industry.

Another plan they used was mass pickets at Columbia. In the meantime, injunctions had been issued, and in defiance of those injunctions they completely blocked off the street in front of Columbia. There were mass arrests. That was in the jurisdiction of the city of Los Angeles. Warner Bros. was in Burbank. In Los Angeles the law-enforcement officers handled them pretty well.

The situation at Columbia resulted in mass arrests of 2,000. That disillusioned a lot of good people who had been swooped up into this thing, and after their sojourn in jail they came out with the thought that was the end.

Another thing they did was, about 8 o'clock in the morning about 500 or 600 got out of their cars and left their cars in the middle of the street.

Mr. VELDE. You are not claiming the Communist Party was responsible for all this?

Mr. BREWER. No. There were a great many people who were dragged into the thing, but I do say that when the show-down came the Communist leaders were in control, because it was at this point that the Screen Actors' Guild began to get into the strike, and it was at this point that they went back to the American Federation of

Labor and demanded that the American Federation of Labor do something, and they didn't get it done because of Mr. Hutcheson's influence.

Mr. VELDE. Can you set the date when the Screen Actors' Guild came in?

Mr. BREWER. It was in October 1946. They went back to the American Federation of Labor and they did not get any satisfaction there, so they came back to Hollywood and called this series of meetings. The first two were held at the Knickerbocker Hotel. The result was agreement on the part of both sides to sit down and try to work out an arbitration plan.

Mr. VELDE. At that time was it generally known among you labor leaders that there was Communist influence at work in carrying on this strike?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. It was at that same time that John Garfield was in the Screen Actors' Guild?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. And was very instrumental in working against communism, so he testified, and in settling the strike?

Mr. BREWER. Well, no; I would not say that that is true. There is no evidence I have been able to find out. Mr. Garfield's presence did not show itself, that I remember, except in one instance, and that is when he attended a meeting of the Screen Actors' Guild; and as far as the second strike was concerned, Garfield's presence is not indicated in any way that I have been able to determine that is conclusive. He was not on their side and was not on our side, but we had always considered him to be on their side.

Mr. VELDE. Do you think it is possible for a man of Mr. John Garfield's position in the Screen Actors' Guild not to know there was a Communist movement in Hollywood at that time?

Mr. BREWER. It would seem to me it would be very difficult for a man to be in the position he was in and not know it. It seems inconceivable to me.

Mr. WOOD. Proceed.

Mr. BREWER. The Screen Actors' Guild held these meetings and we sat down with a committee from the conference. We took the position we would be glad to listen to any arbitration, but that the original award of these three men, which we felt was in good faith, would have to be the basis for arbitration; that it was handed down according to the arbitration agreement we had accepted, and we took the position that was the final decision and any effort of any group to change it could not be acceptable.

Finally the Conference of Studio Unions agreed to accept that position. So we said all right; we would agree upon arbitration, and we had even agreed on a man. We agreed we would ask Mr. Joseph Keenan, a man who had rendered important Government service during the war, and who was one of the outstanding labor mediators in the country on tough labor disputes, and both sides accepted him.

Mr. POTTER. Whom do you mean by "both sides"?

Mr. BREWER. Conference of Studio Unions and IATSE. Sorrell and his group were also at these meetings, and the three law firms were there—Margolis, Esterman, and Isserman. We had a joke about

Hutcheson being represented, in effect, by Isserman, but that was the fact. Isserman was the spokesman.

After we agreed that this arbitration award should be the basis upon which future arbitration should rest, the lawyers retired to reduce it to writing, and it was completely redrafted, and a proposal came back leaving it open on the set erectors; and the arbitration broke up.

It was at that point the Screen Actors' Guild said:

Apparently there is a group that does not want to settle the strike, and we must take a position with the people who have kept their word and see that this influence is removed from our studios.

Mr. POTTER. Did you say "Screen Writers"?

Mr. BREWER. No; Screen Actors. Screen writers were not in it.

Mr. JACKSON. Ronald Reagan was in the Screen Actors' Guild?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. Reagan was in the Army during the first strike. From that time on there has been no one more effective in the effort to rid the industry of this menace than Ronald Reagan.

Mr. POTTER. Who opposed Reagan in the guild at that time?

Mr. BREWER. We always considered Anne Revere and Rose Hobart against us, and for my part I put John Garfield in that position. If I am asked why, it is pretty hard to say.

Mr. JACKSON. Wouldn't his association with the other signers of the telegram be sufficient in your mind to indicate he was opposed at that time to your position?

Mr. BREWER. If Mr. Garfield was not opposed at all times to our position, we were never conscious of that fact, and we were never conscious of it until this controversy came up.

Mr. WOOD. The committee will stand in recess until 3 o'clock.

(Thereupon, at 12:50 p. m., a recess was taken until 3 p. m. the same day.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. WOOD. The committee will be in order.

For the continuation of this hearing I have set up a subcommittee consisting of Messrs. Doyle, Potter, and Wood. They are all present.

#### TESTIMONY OF ROY M. BREWER—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Brewer, have you completed your testimony relating to the four strikes and the purposes of the Communist Party with relation to those strikes?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; I have. I think I have. There were a couple of points that I think are pertinent, which tie in a little closer the Communist nature of the activity which was carried on. One was the appearance on the scene during the strike of internationally known Communists.

During the time that this strike was in progress, the Conference of Studio Unions held a mass meeting every Sunday night at the Legion Stadium in Hollywood, at which time they would harangue the membership for the purpose of keeping up their morale in carrying on the strike, and in their own publications is an interesting study of the persons that appeared at these meetings.

At the meeting preceding Saturday, February 8, which would be, I guess, February 2——



Mr. TAVENNER. State the year, please.

Mr. BREWER. 1947; there appeared Vincente Lombardo Toledano, who pledged the support of the World Federation of Trade Unions and the Latin-American Federation of Labor.

Mr. WOOD. Who was that?

Mr. BREWER. Vincente Lombardo Toledano. He is an internationally known Communist figure who was an officer in international trade unions and at that time was head of Latin-American Federation of Labor.

I have a file of these papers showing that Communists from South America and from Egypt appeared at these meetings. There is a very interesting story of one night when Paul Robeson appeared and walked down the aisle to thundering applause of the audience, and sang without accompaniment some of his songs. This is all in their own publications.

For the purpose of explaining one of the problems we have, I want to point out that at one of these meetings there was a priest by the name of Father Dunne, and Father Dunne gave out some very unreliable information on this strike, and I understand that there has been circulated some material which he put out at that time.

At this same meeting, as reported in their own publication, Toledano appeared. Toledano is an internationally known Communist and had been particularly noted, in his Communist activities, for his attacks on the Catholic Church. I think his record will show that was one of the fields in which he contended the church was an exploiter of the people. And at this meeting at which Toledano appeared, this Jesuit priest appeared, and he paid a very great tribute to Toledano, and said he felt very humble in the presence of this great man.

I would like to submit this publication, and if you desire I can give you a whole series of publications tracing the Communist activity.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like you to furnish the committee with the issues you have spoken of for purposes of analysis.

Mr. BREWER. I thought they might be pertinent.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me hand this back to you that you can attach it to the others which you will file with the committee.

During the testimony of Mr. Dmytryk, a rather general explanation was made of the part that Communist fronts played in the plan for membership campaigns of the Communist Party. Did Communist fronts play an important part in the development of the Communist plan with regard to labor unions?

Mr. BREWER. Well, yes; the Communist fronts did. The Communist fronts played a very important part in publicizing the class struggle and publicizing their efforts to infiltrate and take control of all trade-union activities which they felt would promote the philosophy of their party.

But in this Hollywood situation the fronts played an even more important part in this control of the thought of the community, which certainly followed over into the unions and made it very difficult for those of us who were trying to expose the Communist nature of this thing to get that idea across.

During this period the fronts played a very important part in controlling the thought of the community, which I testified to yesterday. This was really the instrument by which they got all these people,



most of whom were honest, sincere people who wanted to do the right thing, who wanted to serve humanity in a practical way, and wound up finding themselves in an organization that had been manipulated by the Communist Party day after day, week after week, and month after month.

Mr. POTTER. When did it become apparent that these front organizations were actually Communist-controlled?

Mr. BREWER. I think the first time it became generally evident was during the period of the pact. At that time there was an organization known as the Motion-Picture Democratic Committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the committee which was cited as Communist by the Tenney committee?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; that is the organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. And is that the committee which, after being exposed as a Communist-front organization, changed its name in 1945 to the Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

Mr. BREWER. Yes, and it ultimately became the present organization, which is the Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. I believe that is the official title. They dropped the "Independent Citizens' Committee" and call it the Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that organization was cited as a Communist-front organization by this committee and also by the Tenney Committee?

Mr. BREWER. That is correct. It was at that point that it began to become evident that there was more to these fronts than met the eye.

In that connection, I would like to refer to this report of Jeff Kibre, a part of which I read into the record yesterday. This was the report in which he was explaining that Mr. Henschel was a loyal comrade of 3 years' standing, and going down the line he was analyzing the report of Mr. Weiss, which had been sent him via Roy Hudson and Walter Lambert. He was pointing out that some of the unfavorable things Weiss had said in his report were unjustified, and he said:

At present the IA officials are engaged in promoting an underhanded Red scare against the progressive Motion-Picture Democratic Committee, which, as an expression of the Democratic front, is organizing to bring the New Deal to California and the motion-picture industry.

That was the basis on which they sold the Motion-Picture Democratic Committee, without a doubt. But in 1940 the line changed and the New Deal was not so popular with the Communists at that time, because they were very much opposed to the program of President Roosevelt to prepare the country for the inevitable conflict, and they were charging him with being an imperial warmonger.

At that time two men presented a resolution to the executive committee of the Motion-Picture Democratic Committee—and, incidentally, Mr. Sorrell was a member of the board of the Motion-Picture Democratic Committee—a resolution condemning the Soviet-German Pact. Those two men were Philip Dunne and Melvyn Douglas, and when the matter came to a vote the only votes they got for that resolution were their own; everybody else on the executive committee voted against it.

Mr. POTTER. I didn't get the significance of what it was. Will you repeat that, please?

Mr. BREWER. Philip Dunne and Melvyn Douglas introduced a resolution condemning the Stalin-Hitler Pact which had been entered into, and the resolution was defeated. The only votes they got were their own; so they resigned from the Motion-Picture Democratic Committee. It was at that point it became evident this was not a Democratic organization designed to promote the interest of the Democratic Party, but was an instrument of the Communist group. So, it was at that point the Motion-Picture Democratic Committee became exposed.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would not be wise if the witness made that list available to the committee?

Mr. BREWER. I have it here.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I was absent this morning, in attendance on another committee. I am not sure whether the witness has had opportunity to give us the benefit of the knowledge he has on un-American or subversive propaganda instigated from foreign countries. If the witness is not familiar with the resolution under which we operate, it specifically provides we shall go into that subject, "the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries \* \* \*."

Mr. BREWER. Instigated from foreign countries?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes. I would like to ask that if, as you proceed, you have any information on that, you give us the benefit of your knowledge. You mentioned the word "international" a few moments ago.

Mr. BREWER. Toledano, of course, was an internationally known Communist.

Mr. DOYLE. I am calling your attention to the fact that one of the jurisdictions of this committee is that very matter, "subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries," if you have anything on it.

Mr. BREWER. At the outset of my testimony—

Mr. WOOD. Let me suggest at this point that we are trying to get through with the witness this afternoon to avoid the necessity of keeping him here over the week end, more for his benefit than ours, so if, as far as possible, members of the committee will make notes, you will have ample opportunity to ask questions at the conclusion of his testimony, and I think in that manner we will save time.

Mr. BREWER. The Motion Picture Democratic Committee, after the invasion of Russia by Germany, of course the whole complexion changed, and the whole atmosphere, not only in Hollywood but throughout the country, was "Cooperate with Russia and do everything to support the united war effort of the two countries," and it was then they went to town.

In 1945 the Motion Picture Democratic Committee became the Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. That was the first real contact I had with this group.

I have said, and I believe without contradiction, that the Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions was the most successful Communist front in America. It was through the Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee primarily that they were able to set up this domination that extended throughout the community of Hollywood and southern California, and to some extent the Democratic Party in California.

They had on their list of contributors some of the most important people in Hollywood, people who had no basic sympathy for the Communist Party, but under this front they contributed thousands and thousands of dollars. A lot of these highly paid artists were contributing hundreds of dollars a month into this front, a good deal of which was expended in getting nominated to important political positions men who would accept their domination and their influence.

At the time that this strike took place, the executive secretary of the Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee was Mr. George Pepper, and Mr. George Pepper has been identified by previous witnesses as a member of the Communist Party. That fits the pattern that a Communist front has a non-Communist chairman, but it usually has a well disciplined Communist Party member as secretary.

There is another individual that should be mentioned in this case, Mrs. Ellenore Abowitz. She has been called a Communist many times and has never denied it, to my knowledge. She was behind the scenes at all times, maneuvering the activities of this Communist front.

When I give you this paper you will see the impressive list of names under the name of George Pepper. They issued an advertisement in which they attempted to pressure the National Labor Relations Board to get the kind of decision they thought they should have. There was a rumor that the Board had issued a decision unfavorable to the Conference of Studio Unions, and there is evidence that this decision was recalled and changed. We didn't make a protest about it. At that time the new Board was set up, and there was no taint at that point of Communist influence in the Board proper; but in connection with that I sent a letter to every member of the executive committee of the Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee asking them, as the representative of our international union, whether or not they supported this unfavorable position which this organization had taken in connection with our union in this strike, because it seemed illogical in view of the fact our union was a union of 50 years' standing in the theatrical industry and had helped the actors in the years past; also, it seemed incredible that these stars should take this fly-by-night organization in contrast to an old established union.

Out of the fifty-some-odd letters I sent out, I only got one reply. In the letter I said that "If I do not hear from you I will assume that you do approve of this action, because it has been issued in your name." I got only one reply denouncing that action, and that was from George Jessel. He is the only one who came back and said, "No, I do not approve that decision."

That is indicative of the tremendous influence they had. I will give you this list because the vast majority of these people were people who did not sympathize with the program of the Communist Party, but of course you will find in this list a great many men who have been named and who are now recognized as Communist Party members, such as John Howard Lawson, Sam Moore, Earl Robinson, and a few others.

Because of the fact so many of these people were induced to contribute to this type of organization which followed the Communist Party line regularly, these people looked to this organization for guidance on issues of the day, and it was as a result of this activity that whenever an issue came up on any public matter in the community,



eventually the arts, sciences, and professions group would come out with a logical explanation, and the next day every cocktail and dinner party would reflect that attitude. It was unbelievable the manner in which they were able to completely direct the affairs of this community through that kind of a front.

After the hearings in 1947, then, of course, they began to flock away from this as well as other fronts.

MR. TAVENNER. What you have said about the use of Communist fronts illustrates the power that Communist fronts had in the community in that period; does it not?

MR. BREWER. Yes, and as I say, so far as the Communists in Hollywood were concerned, the real power of the Communists was exercised through these fronts.

There was another function for which they used these fronts, and that was to get individuals—in other words, a political organization that wanted access to the financial resources—and they were large—of Hollywood, had to get the approval of the arts, sciences, and professions to get that financial support, with the result that the individuals within the party who would take their point of view would get all the money and all the help and all the ballyhoo, and the stars would appear at their rallies, and others would get nothing.

The Democratic Party has been hurt no end by the activities of this kind of front, because they place the party organization in the position of putting up people who are not Democrats as we know them but who have the pro-Communist point of view.

I speak as a Democrat myself. They tried to do the Democratic Party the same as they did to the unions. Any part they could not control, they went out to destroy, and they had this vast amount of money at their disposal.

MR. WALTER. That is the same line they followed in Hawaii. The committee, in holding hearings there last year, was charged with trying to break up the Democratic Party, when actually the Democratic Party had gotten into the hands of people of another shade.

MR. BREWER. I was in Hawaii myself, and they have hurt the Democratic Party in such a way that it will take a generation to repair the damage.

MR. WALTER. In the course of your studies of the situation in California, did you ever come across a Prof. Linus Pauling?

MR. BREWER. I don't know him personally, but his name appears in a great many of these fronts.

MR. WALTER. He is one of a number of educators who have issued a call for a meeting to be held in the Henry Hudson Hotel in New York, July 16 and 17. It is called the bill of rights conference, and it is very interesting to me to find that among the people in the forefront of this alleged conference are a number of well-known Communists and Communist-front figures, so that it seems to me that this conference, so-called, is nothing but a meeting of Communists, who probably want to protest further convictions such as were had in the case of the 12 Communists in New York.

MR. BREWER. I think it has to be recognized that so far as their influence on the country is concerned, the Communist front plays just as important a part as the Communist Party itself, because one of the real objectives of the Communist Party is to prevent our country



from solving its problems through our democratic processes, and it is through the misinformation of fronts that they attempt to do that.

I want to bring to your attention another activity which is very significant in showing how smoothly they are able to use the front approach to accomplish the things they want. In many cases they used educators. Sometimes I think the educators were completely taken in. Others I think may have been part and parcel of their group.

There are two educators who appear over and over again in Hollywood. Both are psychologists. Dr. Franklin Fearing has been close to hundreds of these fronts, and Dr. Frank Davis also.

You heard testimony from Mr. Collins about the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization. I wanted to trace for you a little matter they put over in connection with the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, and which is still going on.

The Hollywood Writers' Mobilization was a semi-official agency of the Government, financed partly out of war activity funds. They promoted a writers' congress at Los Angeles—

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of that? October 1943?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. The Hollywood Writers' Mobilization promoted this congress. Mr. Lawson was one of the prominent men figuring in that, and also Dr. Fearing.

In Mr. Budenz's book he traces this particular matter. It isn't very long, and with your permission I would like to read it in connection with the development of this particular record. He points out that there had been discussions within party circles of the efforts to continue their program of utilizing the writers and actors and so-called professionals. He said:

One day in 1943, Trachtenberg reported that "amazing progress" was being made among certain American scientists; and Berman, who was section organizer for New York's artists, writers and actors, gave a glowing account of advances in Manhattan and Hollywood. It was an optimistic session. Then I proposed that we capitalize on these "gains" to strengthen the party's leadership among American intellectuals of all kinds. The best way, I suggested, would be to channel our present strength into a committee for the re-election of Mr. Roosevelt. Naturally, it would be completely under Red domination. We knew, of course, that the same Red professionals who had denounced the President as "another Hitler" in 1940 could be counted on to cheer him now, if told to.

My proposal was enthusiastically accepted, and we decided that Trachtenberg and Berman should take it to the Politburo for approval. The approval was quickly given, for the Politburo had been experimenting on a smaller scale with a somewhat similar idea. To test its possibilities, they had ordered the comrades in the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, led by John Howard Lawson, to work out a Writers' Congress. Under the direction of Trachtenberg, Jerome, and the Politburo, the comrades on the coast had persuaded Dr. Robert Sproul, president of the University of California, to lend them the campus for a meeting place and to let them use the university's name as a cosponsor of the event. Under its win-the-war dress, the congress had been successful—and a marked triumph for the party.

That is from page 220 of Mr. Budenz's book, *Men Without Faces*.

One of the developments that came out of the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization was a continuation committee, composed of John Howard Lawson and Dr. Fearing. They set up a joint project with the University of California in Los Angeles to publish what is known as the Hollywood Quarterly. The Hollywood Quarterly is still being

published, and I have a current copy which I bought on the newstand before I came here. It says on the cover:

**HOLLYWOOD QUARTERLY**—Published under the sponsorship of the University of California, Volume V, spring, 1951, No. 3, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

And the editors are: Franklin Fearing, Walter K. Kingson, Kenneth MacGowan, Irving Pichel, Abraham Polonsky, and Franklin P. Rolfe.

If you will trace this Hollywood Quarterly since 1943, you will see an array of writers and individuals who have put out, under the sponsorship of the university with taxpayers' funds, articles which have promoted the Communist Party line and have promoted Russian films, and have helped some of these writers named to get jobs.

Mr. DOYLE. What did the California Un-American Activities Committee do about it, if anything? Has the Governor done anything about it? Why do they continue to expend the money of the taxpayers of California for that purpose?

Mr. BREWER. I don't know, but I know this has been known for quite some time, and this is the spring 1951 issue.

Mr. DOYLE. Did the Tenney committee look into that?

Mr. BREWER. They took testimony on it.

Mr. DOYLE. Did they do anything about it?

Mr. BREWER. I think you will find the Tenney report has complained vigorously of Communist influences in the University of California. This publication has been going on for a period of approximately 7 years.

Mr. POTTER. What is the stated purpose for publishing this Quarterly?

Mr. BREWER. It is a publication to give a review of matters which have a bearing on motion pictures, primarily. It was sort of a liaison project to give a medium of expression to matters which had to do with the motion picture industry located in southern California.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was John Howard Lawson one of the editors prior to the time he became involved because of his refusal to testify before this committee?

Mr. BREWER. I am sure he has contributed articles to it, but whether he is one of the editors, I don't know. I understand he is, but I have been unable to ascertain that definitely.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other Communist fronts in Hollywood were utilized for the purpose of advancing Communist Party purposes in the moving picture industry?

Mr. BREWER. Of course there were several Communist fronts that were a part of national fronts that were used, such as the Anti-Nazi Refugee Committee. They were used by the Communist Party to develop interest in their program and to bring persons into their orbit.

In connection with the strike there were several fronts which they organized. They would create a new one almost every night. One of the things they organized was a Citizens' Committee for the Motion Picture Strikers, through which they attempted to influence public opinion with respect to the strike, and which also was used to raise funds which they disbursed under the title of the Hollywood Welfare Fund to aid the people they thought needed aid.

I have a circular put out by the Citizens' Committee for the Motion Picture Strikers. They would go out to people on these other fronts and tell them these poor people had been locked out of their jobs and they should help them. It was a tremendously successful operation on their part.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have noticed from the testimony before the committee so far, that in the organization known as the Committee for the First Amendment, persons living in quite widely separated parts of the United States seems to have joined in that movement very quickly after it was started. Do you know anything about the plan put into effect to secure that support so quickly?

Mr. BREWER. There is no question of a doubt in my mind but that the line that runs through that organization is the Communist Party line. As was pointed out in the Kibre letter, when Jeff Kibre, an agent of the Communist Party in California, wanted support, he got in touch with party headquarters; and a man named Max Weiss appeared in Ohio. That was done in the name of the party.

But in setting up these fronts it is very clear that the party machinery will take hold of the formation of the front. They will pick the individual that they want to head it, and in most instances, if it is an important front, they will not put a Communist as the chairman. The chairman will be the window dressing, and he will not be a Communist, but will be someone they have been able to get to come along with their program. He will be at the head of the organization when actually he knows nothing about it, and the work will be carried on by the old party workers.

A very amusing incident occurred; it wasn't amusing, but it would have been if not over such a tragic matter. When the Chinese Reds landed in New York to appeal before the United Nations, a telegram and bouquet of roses were sent them in behalf of the Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions in Hollywood. Of course, there was a terrible reaction to that activity, because the country was very worked up over the Communist war, and everybody in Hollywood started saying, "Well, who is on this board?" and they dug out these names, and everybody began contacting the people who knew them and protesting this action, with the result that the board issued a statement that they knew nothing whatsoever about this order having gone out to present these roses to the Chinese Reds.

Probably the only one who knew this was being sent was the executive secretary. However, the reaction in the community was, I think, in the long run, favorable, because it certainly pointed out where the council stood, and it reduced its activities by just that much.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Brewer, you have testified at some length regarding your experiences during the period of the strikes and the confusion that existed in thinking within the union on issues that later turned out to be promoted or sponsored by the Communists. You indicated there were times when persons within your own union appeared to be advocates of the other cause.

Mr. BREWER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that mean that you found persons within your particular union that you considered to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.



Mr. TAVENNER. What did you do about it?

Mr. BREWER. Well, in connection with Henschel, we held trials for Henschel and I think around 10 other people. I think in all there were 11 who were identified with Henschel who were expelled as a result of that. We had a preliminary to the trial of the 12 Communists. We had a record of 4,000 pages of testimony which went into the record in connection with that trial. They brought in their people and read material in the record to confuse it, but we stuck it out and they were found guilty and expelled.

With reference to local 683, there were quite a number of Communists in that. We tried some 280 persons in connection with that union. I think about 125 of those persons were expelled.

In connection with that, there are a couple very interesting characters who appeared on the scene. One is Harry Carlyle, who had been assigned to a job as shipping clerk at Pathé Laboratories, and had appeared as assistant editor. Harry Carlyle is now up for deportation as an alien Communist. He was the former editor of the *Western Worker*, and I understand is now in jail in California awaiting deportation. Here he appeared in an obscure job as shipping clerk in order to have access to our union.

Another was Goldblatt.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any local whose charter was revoked because of Communist infiltration?

Mr. BREWER. The charter was not revoked in the case of local 683, but the affairs of the local were taken out of the hands of the individuals who had been in control and placed under my supervision, and it was under that supervision that these trials were held.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many individuals were there who were expelled from your organization as a result of Communist Party membership or activities?

Mr. BREWER. Actually, the basis on which they were tried was in connection with their support of the CSU strike. We did not have conclusive evidence of all of these people's Communist membership, but we did have evidence that they had violated the oath of allegiance to our union. There were about 125 expelled from local 683.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any officials of your union now who are known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. BREWER. There are none. If there were, they would not be there. There are some we suspect, but we cannot establish it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you able to obtain reliable and satisfactory proof regarding party membership, would you take action?

Mr. BREWER. We definitely would, and I would not be surprised if before this hearing is finished there will be some such evidence.

Mr. POTTER. I would like to ask you a question along that line. Do you know Mr. H. J. Kistner, financial secretary of Moving Picture Painters and Scenic Artists Local 644?

Mr. BREWER. No; I do not know him.

Mr. POTTER. I have a letter from him in anticipation of your appearance here as a witness, and I would like to read a portion of his letter and get your comment:

I might say that my own organization (local 644)—

Mr. BREWER. Is that painters or printers?



Mr. POTTER. Painters' local 644 (continuing reading):

which was seriously involved in the strike of 1945 and the lock-out of 1946—all the officers of which have signed non-Communist affidavits—took steps to clear itself of any Communist members when indisputable proof was available. We did not want to fall into the trap of calling everyone Red who disagreed with us.

However, many of the people whom we suspected of being at least Communist followers, deserted our local early and have since joined Mr. Brewer's IATSE.

Do you have a comment?

Mr. BREWER. First of all, as I said, that is the organization of which Mr. Sorrell is the officer, and the international union which chartered the organization which is mentioned themselves tried Mr. Sorrell and found him guilty of associating with Communist groups and being a member of Communist groups or fronts, and ruled that he could not hold office for a period of 5 years.

This local union which he mentions is resisting that order and disputing the findings of the international, and asking the international to prevent that order from being put in effect.

Mr. POTTER. In other words, they are backing Sorrell?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. As to the members who left his local and have since joined IATSE, if there had been any suspicion that they were Communists, we would not have accepted them into membership. Screening them when you take them in is much better than kicking them out after they get in. I do not think any of them who left Mr. Sorrell were Communists.

Mr. WOOD. In that connection, if Mr. Sorrell's organization has evidence of Communist affiliation or membership of any former members who have since joined your union, would you like to have that list?

Mr. BREWER. We certainly would, and we will see that the charges are filed at once and trial had.

Mr. WOOD. Do you now invite that?

Mr. BREWER. I do invite it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have all the officers of your labor organization signed a non-Communist affidavit?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. I think we were the second or third organization to sign the non-Communist affidavits.

There is an individual in Mr. Sorrell's organization, Frank Specter, who testified before the California committee that he had been a Communist since 1919, had never denied it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where is he now?

Mr. BREWER. As far as I know he is in Los Angeles. He was in this union during the entire period, but he was expelled later on, I think.

Mr. POTTER. Did Mr. Sorrell sign a non-Communist affidavit?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. So has Mr. Harry Bridges.

Mr. WOOD. Any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like you to file with the committee the transcript of testimony before the Tenney committee to which you referred yesterday, and also the letters of Mr. Kibre, particularly the one you have a photostatic copy of.

Mr. BREWER. Yes. I wanted to make some statements in connection with that, because I tried to move so fast that there were a few points that perhaps members of the committee might have lost.

One was in connection with the testimony which establishes, I think conclusively, the link between the Soviet Union and the motion-picture industry. I wanted to point out that the testimony before the California committee was given under oath after the investigator had made a preliminary investigation which included going to Carmel, seeing the notes from which some of the testimony was given, listening to dictagraph records, and checking the fact that Michael Aisenstein was in San Francisco during that period and was representing Amtorg and was Commissioner for Heavy Industries of the U. S. S. R., and that all that testimony was given under oath. I talked to the chief investigator, and he indicated that so far as he could determine there would be no difficulty at all in obtaining certified copies of this from California if it is desired.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before it is made a part of the record as an exhibit, we would like that done.

Mr. BREWER. In connection with the Kibre letters, I did not indicate the manner in which they were obtained. These letters came into our possession through the officers of a court. At that time there was quite a little concern about Communist activity in Los Angeles on the part of the courts and the law-enforcement officers. There was a squad attached to the police department in Los Angeles that had that sole function. It has now been abandoned, but it appears it was a worthy operation.

In connection with the literature having to do with local 37, of which Mr. Kibre was a member, he was served with a subpoena, to which he failed to respond, and the officers of the court went to his apartment to get him, and when they got there he barred the door and attempted to destroy these papers. They got those papers and we were given copies, and when they were exposed Mr. Kibre disappeared. Kibre did not appear to defend himself. He disappeared from the Hollywood scene, and reappeared in the North American Aviation strike, and later in the Fishermen's Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. And where is he now?

Mr. BREWER. He is an officer in the Fishermen's Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that in the United States or Canada?

Mr. BREWER. The union?

Mr. TAVENNER. The Fishermen's Union.

Mr. BREWER. The chapter in Los Angeles, because not too long ago he was there. He was a defendant in an antitrust suit brought by the Government not too long ago.

I think that covers the points I had in mind.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. I have no questions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Did I understand you to say the law firm of Katz, Gallagher and Margolis were attorneys for George Wheeler?

Mr. BREWER. They were attorneys for local 683, which in our judgment was captured by the Communist leadership in 1940, and during that period they were on retainer as legal counsel for that local union, and in the course of the strike we tried the Communists in local 44, and just about the time of the trial local 683 paid an additional fee of \$3,000 to Margolis, and the business agent of that local

union and other members of that local union appeared as the official counsel, with Mr. Margolis sitting with them and advising them how to defend Mr. Henschel.

Mr. DOYLE. I wrote down yesterday you said, "The strength of the underground organization is probably as great today as then," referring back, I think, to 1946. Do I understand from that statement that in your judgment the Communist underground organization is as strong today as it was in 1946 in this country?

Mr. BREWER. Well, in the first place, I really can't testify as to how strong the underground organization is at this time. I think a careful study of the Communist Party points out that what Russia wants today is different from what she wanted in 1946. It seems to me that the principal function of the Communist Party from here on out will be sabotage and espionage. By way of precaution I want to repeat, on the basis of my analysis and study, it is still there, it is still strong, and we still have a fight on our hands, but as to how strong, I really couldn't testify with any degree of authority.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you have any information on the fronts that are operating today?

Mr. BREWER. The principle front operating in Hollywood today is the Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which sent the bouquet of roses to the Chinese Reds. They can no longer use that front for the purposes they previously used fronts. Any time the Arts, Sciences, and Professions announces they are holding a meeting, it is a cue to Hollywood to stay away.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't know whether our counsel or the chairman spoke about this subsection of the law under which we operate or not. Subsection (3) charges us with the responsibility of going into all other questions that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation. In your varied experience, have you any suggestions you would like to make to this committee as to remedial legislation?

Mr. BREWER. Of course that subject always comes back to the question of whether Communist Party should be outlawed or not. From my experience I cannot conceive of the Communist Party remaining above ground if it were not to their benefit to do so. That has been the principal argument, I believe, against outlawing the party. I think that is an indication of how many people can be deceived by their propaganda. It seems completely illogical to me that if outlawing the Communist Party was going to drive them underground, that they would be opposed to it, because I think the Communist know better as to what is good for the Communist than we do. They have shown a great ability to adapt themselves to any situation, and I think they know what is good or bad for them, and I think it would be bad for the Communists if they were outlawed.

Mr. DOYLE. Apropos of what you have said about the Hollywood Quarterly, what funds have been and are being used to publish it? Has any effort been made to eliminate that appropriation?

Mr. BREWER. I don't know. I have not been in a crusade against the Quarterly. I do know something about the efforts to impose a loyalty oath in California, and they have had considerable difficulty in connection with that in California.

Mr. DOYLE. That is all.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Velde.



Mr. VELDE. I want to thank the witness for his appearance here. You have contributed a great deal to the information the committee is assembling on the Hollywood Communist movement.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Potter.

Mr. POTTER. In your testimony you stated that the Communist-front organizations were political. Would that have anything to do with the election of Mr. Kenny as attorney general?

Mr. BREWER. I feel that that is a very important example of the influence of the Communist front in the Hollywood community, and how it extended itself to the rest of the State.

I don't care to get in a controversy on that, but I think, from my experience with Robert W. Kenny, he has indicated his willingness to take the Communist Party program in almost every instance where that issue has arisen; and at the time the strikes took place he was attorney general of California, and I think that is a positive indication of how they were able to influence forces within the Communist Party. When the test came and Mr. Kenny had to choose between the Democratic candidate and Mr. Wallace, he chose Mr. Wallace; yet as a result of this front influence they were able to get him elected attorney general, and if this had not broken he might have been Governor of California.

Mr. DOYLE. He was not elected attorney general after he supported Wallace?

Mr. BREWER. He was attorney general, and when the test came he chose the other party, so there was no indication his loyalty was to the Democratic Party when he was elected.

Mr. DOYLE. I want the record to be clear he was not elected attorney general of California after he had sided with the Progressive Party.

Mr. BREWER. That is true.

Mr. POTTER. I wanted to bring out the fact that apparently these Communist-front organizations exerted a great deal of influence in political fields as well as controlling thought in the Hollywood community. I assume Mr. Kenny had the Hollywood support at the time he was elected?

Mr. BREWER. He did, at all times.

Congressman Jackson asked me to put into the record the names of persons who have fought against Communists constantly. Shall I read them into the record?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. BREWER. These are persons who have militantly supported the program of the Motion Picture Alliance: Adolph Menjou, actor; Robert Arthur, producer; Sam Wood, producer; Howard Emmett Rogers, writer; Gary Cooper, actor; Barbara Stanwyck, actress.

Helen Brooks, actress; Cedric Gibbons, art director; Eddie Buzzell, actor-producer; John Ford, producer-director; LeRoy Prinz, dance director; Herbert Yates, head of Republic Pictures; Kane Richmond, actor; Charles Cane, actor; Steve Fisher, writer; Borden Chase, writer.

Aubrey Blair, labor representative; Cappy DuVal, labor representative; Richard Gordon, extra player; Fred Niblo, Jr., writer; Rupert Hughes, writer; Jack Moffitt, writer; Richard McCauley, writer; Murph McHenry, publicist; Tommy McCloud, publicist; Trem Carr, independent producer; Steve Broidy, independent producer; Cliff Lyons, stunt man.



Those who have fought it outside the Motion Picture Alliance in an organizational way were:

Ronald Reagan, actor; George Murphy, actor; Edward Arnold, actor; Jack Dales, executive secretary, Screen Actors Guild; Art Arthur, writer and secretary, Motion Picture Industry Council; Y. Frank Freeman, executive producer; Leon Ames, actor.

In recent years the fight has been taken up within the Motion Picture Industry Council. In this fight many of the people who formerly had been dragged into some of these front activities have joined hands with us and others.

Mr. WOOD. Do you mean to leave the inference that that is an exclusive list?

Mr. BREWER. I do not. There have been many others who have fought, but these are persons who have sort of led the fight. The Motion Picture Alliance itself has just under 2,000 members. But these are some who have been outstanding. There really has been only a small group of people who have led the fight.

In this connection, Art Arthur, secretary of the Motion Picture Industry Council, has been very helpful; and Eddie Cheyfitz, assistant to Eric Johnston has been very helpful. Eddie Cheyfitz was a former Communist, does not deny it, but in connection with the Motion Picture Industry Council he has been very helpful in trying to clarify the situation.

Mr. DOYLE. I ask you this question: Do you feel that organized labor—I am referring now to the A. F. of L., of which you are part and parcel—do you feel that that organization has done and is now doing all it should do to try to eliminate subversive influence, Communist influence, not only in Hollywood but wherever it is?

Mr. BREWER. It is hard to say if a group is doing everything they should do, but I think they are doing an outstanding job. I feel that I can say with modesty, in view of the record, that the one potent force that stood between the complete control of this industry by the Communists and their defeat at this crucial point in 1945 were the A. F. of L. unions. We had other people who helped us, but that was the force that blocked their way and made final victory possible, I think. The community is very militant today in fighting it.

Mr. WOOD. Isn't it true that all the labor unions at the present time are more conscious than ever before of the necessity of fighting this Communist infiltration and influence?

Mr. BREWER. I think that is true except the small segment that was a part of the CIO and that is Communist-dominated. But I think they are doing a militant job.

There is one little device which we used which might be of help to those people reading this record in connection with fighting Communists in unions. We feel we are old hands at it. That is based on this fundamental premise, that you can never support a Communist in any activity, no matter how good that activity may be on its face, because any time a Communist brings in a good program he is bringing it in for a purpose which he will ultimately use for the Communist Party.

In conventions if a Communist brings in a good resolution, we realize that if we support his resolution he will pick up some people who will fall for his scheme. He might bring in nine good resolutions

and on the tenth the party line would be there. We have learned that the hard way, and if a Communist brings in a resolution, even if it is perfect, we will have one of our own members introduce a similar resolution, with a small change in it, and pass ours and file his.

That is important. These people who have been in fronts have to realize the same thing, that the only reason the Communists set up a front with a good name is to ultimately use it for a Communist purpose, and no matter how good the purpose is, if a person supports an organization that is a Communist front, he is aiding and abetting the Communist Party.

Mr. WOOD. Permit me to join with the other members of the committee in expressing our appreciation for your coming here and giving us this testimony. It has been very enlightening to all of us and will be very helpful.

Mr. BREWER. Thank you.

Mr. WOOD. Unless you have some further questions, we will excuse Mr. Brewer.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. WOOD. You may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. WOOD. Do you have any further witnesses today?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. WOOD. The committee will stand adjourned until Tuesday morning at 10:30.

(Thereupon, at 5 p. m. on Friday, May 18, 1951, an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, May 22, 1951, at 10:30 a. m.)

×





GOV DOC  
Y 4.UN 1/2:C 73/21/  
PT.1-4  
United States. Congress.  
House. Committee on

[illegible]





